AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—VOL. VIII.—(XVIII.)—APRIL, 1898.—NO. 4

CLERICAL STUDIES.

XXXIV.

THE TRAINING IN BIBLE STUDIES. (2.)

IT was the object of our last paper to show that in every Christian age the Bible was justly regarded as the primary source of all sacred knowledge, appealed to almost exclusively for many centuries, and never lost sight of, even after its teachings had been cast in the scientific forms of theology; that the intellectual value of individuals and of periods in the past might be ordinarily measured by their knowledge of the Bible; that in our time the Sacred Books have awakened an interest and led to an amount of intelligent and laborious investigation never witnessed before, and with results such that more than ever the clergy is bound not to lose sight of them, but rather to take their share in the work, and, if possible, to guide it.

But the performance of such a duty implies a proper initiation. A Bible student needs to be trained, as well as a student of theology, of history or of sacred oratory, and this training forms no inconsiderable part of the work of our seminaries. We have now to consider how it may be done.

The aspirant who enters a seminary is generally less acquainted with the Bible than a young Protestant in similar circumstances, his religious education being based, not on the Sacred Text, as is the case with the latter, but on the catechism duly developed. Yet he is not an entire stranger to the Sacred Books. He knows at least something of the

Gospels, something of Old Testament history. He has read, in his literary studies, beautiful passages from the prophets; he has heard or come across numberless Biblical quotations. But all that is incomplete and incoherent. What he needs is a consecutive, scientific knowledge, a closer acquaintance with what is more practically useful, and with it, a correct view of Biblical science as a whole, sufficiently broad to comprise future as well as present work, with foundations solid enough to sustain the superstructure of ever growing knowledge.

Two kinds of work are necessary for such a purpose; one personal and private, the other under the guidance of a teacher.

I.

First of all, it is by private work that the student gets that initial acquaintance with the Sacred Text which is implied in all subsequent study. It matters little how or where he begins. The Bible is not, properly speaking, a book; it is a literature—a collection of writings spreading over a period of fifteen hundred years—narratives, poems, proverbs, sacred songs, letters, prophecies, parables, legislative enactments—which may be taken up almost anywhere, as is done in regard to every other literature, although, from a chronological, or a logical, or a practical point of view, there are courses which are visibly preferable to others. This first survey should be of a rapid kind—just sufficient to get a general impression of each book and of its contents, and an initial view of the Sacred Books as a whole.

A second and more careful reading should follow, being confined to the most important books, and pursued with the object of getting a firmer hold of them. It is at that stage that, for the first time, extraneous help will become desirable, in the shape of a short "introduction" to each one of the books taken up, and pointing out its origin, its purpose and its principle features. If the student could gather this information from the Sacred Book itself, it would be better still. But even in such a case, he will always do well

to place his observations side by side with those of the Introduction and so correct and complete the former by the latter. If, as is likely, he finds it easier and pleasanter to begin by reading his Introduction, he should read it over a second time after getting through the book he is engaged upon, to make sure that he has found in it all the Introduction had led him to expect. Almost any of our books of Introduction: *Dixon*, *Vigouroux*, *Cornely*, *Lami*, *Ubaldi*, and quite recently *Dr. Breen;* or even the Oxford and Cambridge Manuals: (*Helps to the Study of the Bible*:—*Cambridge Companion to the Bible*) will serve equally well the present purpose. In this second reading of the Bible, what serves most is the attention and reflection of the reader. The Sacred Writings are not different in that regard from any other books. The more thoroughly one enters into them, clearly the more he will get out of them. To secure attention and reflection, the most ordinary methods are the most effective. There is, first, the practice of marking the text in some clear and distinct manner that catches the eye and impresses itself on the memory. The reader may, for example, stroke, as he goes along, interlinearily or marginally, first, actions, thoughts, expressions beautiful or striking; secondly, facts or circumstances which seem inexplicable or strange; thirdly, passages which are obscure or unintelligible. Each category should have its distinctive mark, and it is easy to see how much attention and thought will be requisite to apply them judiciously.

In the next place, the student should write, as he proceeds, short notes embodying the chief remarks he has made and the reflections worth remembering which have been awakened in his mind. Thus he should, first, set down the questions of importance that occur to him and that he is unable to solve; secondly, he should record his remarks on each chapter or section; and thirdly, still more on each book when he has got to the end of it. These remarks may be very crude and even injudicious. But though worthless to anybody else, they are always valuable to the writer, in so far as they have led him to think and have opened his mind

to a more accurate or deeper conception of things connected with the subject of his study when it comes to be set before him.

We shall have more to say later on of the private work of the Biblical student; but from now we wish to emphasize the fact that it cannot begin too soon nor be kept up too steadily; neither can the teacher do any greater service to those under his care than by initiating them into the right way of taking it up, and by making sure that they remain faithful to it. We have reasons to fear that a great deal of time is lost by beginners, and perhaps by others, in what we might call a passive perusal of the Bible, without any definite aim or positive effort.

II.

The mission of the teacher, then, is first of all to guide by suggestion and by supervision the personal work of the student at every stage. It is, next, to convey to him a certain amount of accurate and useful information which unaided he could hardly attain to. It is, lastly, to open up before him the lines of subsequent study, and so awaken his curiosity and stir up his soul that he will faithfully and even eagerly pursue in later years the work begun in the seminary. It is obvious that only a man who has devoted years of close study to all the leading aspects of the Bible can give such a manner of initiation. A time was when the elementary teaching of Scripture implied little preparation and no special fitness. But that time is past, and henceforth only trained specialists can attempt it with any hope of success.

And as the level of Biblical studies is raised, more time has to be devoted to them. The lectures—varying from two to five a week—should extend over the four or five years of the seminary course, and this is none too much if we consider the amount of ground to be covered.

As regards the order to be followed, it must largely depend on the condition and circumstances of the students, as well as on the individual taste and preparation of the professor. Yet there is such a thing as a normal order, based on the

nature of the subject, which should not be departed from without reason.

Logically, the questions of Introduction should come first. But while some of them are accessible from the beginning, the most important, to be fully understood and apppreciated, require a knowledge of particulars and an amount of reflection which can be expected only at a later period. We refer, of course, to the questions of general introduction; those referring to each book in particular are naturally to be taken up with the book itself. Many, indeed, of the latter are so closely interwoven with one another and connected with the general principles, that it is almost impossible to keep them asunder. As to the general principles themselves, their import is to be gathered chiefly from the individual cases in which they find their application; they, consequently, come up again and again to be studied in their various connections, with the result of leaving each time a more accurate conception of their true measure and meaning.

It is among the questions of Introduction that are to be found most of the Biblical problems of the day—the origin, the true character, the date, inspiration, textual value, etc., of the various books; and the question naturally arises, how far they should be made a subject of discussion at any time in an elementary course.

There are extreme views on the subject. Some, struck by the evil following on the investigation of such questions, would have them almost entirely kept out of sight. Others, impressed by the fact that these are the live questions of the day, regarding which the priest is liable at any time to be interrogated, would have him give his chief care to them.

The truth, as usual, lies in a middle course. It is inadmissible, on the one side, that the future defender of the true faith should be left in ignorance of the weak or threatened points of the position he holds. He cannot be expected to deal off-hand with difficulties he never heard of before; neither is it proper that his information on such subjects, even if he is not compelled to discuss them, should

be dependent on chance, or on the imperfect and often inaccurate information which he might derive from his intercourse with books picked up at random or with men only a little less ignorant than himself. On the other hand, a special study of these more difficult problems, so much dwelt upon in our time, would be decidedly out of place. The beginner has neither the maturity of mind nor the knowledge of facts which would enable him to form a personal judgment on the points at issue; he would soon lose his way amid the endless complexity of views and theories, and the final result would be a helpless confusion of thought, and, it might be, the unsettling of his most fundamental convictions. What he needs is a general conception, clear and accurate, though limited, of the work that has been and is being done on and around the Bible; of the principal views that have been held in succession regarding it, and especially of those that are presently in the ascendant. It is not the time to discuss them, but their value will be sufficiently determined by the positive teaching of the master, which, like all that is elementary, should be mainly traditional and conservative.

III.

The Bible is chiefly a record of God's dealings with mankind. Several of its books are purely historical, and the historic element pervades most of the others, forming one of the chief links that bind them together and give them unity. It is, furthermore, what is easiest to understand, and what helps most effectively to understand the rest. The best way, consequently, to take hold of the Bible is to begin by a careful study of Old and New Testament History.

The aim of the former (Old Testament History) would be to get as full and accurate a knowledge as possible of the Jewish people; first, the facts of their tribal and national life, from Abraham to Christ—in Egypt, in the desert, in the promised land, in their dispersion, under and after the captivity, in their subjugation to the Persians, to the Greeks, to the Romans; next, the history of the surrounding peoples

with which that of the Jews is constantly interwoven and without which it cannot be well understood; lastly, a view of their national and racial characteristics, of their manners, their notions, their aspirations and beliefs. All these are the constituent elements, as it were, of the soil in which their religion was divinely planted, and from which their Sacred Books arose. Once understood, they account for numberless special features of the Sacred Writings and light up details which without them would remain utterly unintelligible.

The same may be said of the geography and topography of Palestine and, in general, of the Bible lands. Without their help, the sacred narrative conveys but a vague and confusing impression of the facts. The wanderings of the patriarchs, the exodus of Israel, the conquest and division of the promised land, the various political fortunes of the chosen people, become distinctly conceivable only through a knowledge of ancient geography. The physical geography of Judea and Galilee helps greatly to understand the life of our Lord and even many of His lessons, while the work of St. Paul, from beginning to end, can be realized only when seen in its historical and geographical setting.

It follows that no instructor in Biblical knowledge should rest content until his scholars are able to locate at once every historic spot, so far as known, in the Holy Land and in the adjacent countries, its distance from Jerusalem and from other centres, etc. He should also make them familiar with the physical aspects, the climate, the products of Palestine from north to south just as they are, etc., etc.

This kind of information forms part of the general Introduction, but being the natural auxiliary of history, it takes its place as part of it, and is one of those subjects which can without difficulty be taken up from the beginning.

As regards the other questions, such as the Canon of the Sacred Books, their language, versions, laws of interpretation, etc., they will have to be treated with care later on, and the longer they are deferred the better they will be understood by the student.

IV.

We now come to the study of the individual books of the Old and New Testaments. Obviously a choice has to be made among them, as they are of very unequal importance, and there is not room for a detailed study of all.

The New Testament naturally comes first, and in the New Testament, the Gospels.

1. The Gospels are mainly historical and are supposed to have been already investigated under that aspect. But they contain at the same time the highest and holiest truths of divine revelation. A priest is the preacher of all divine truth, but he is above all a preacher of the Gospel. There is, consequently, no part of Sacred Writ he should know so well, and of this knowledge, familiar and deep, the foundations have to be laid in the seminary course. How this may best be done is a question to be solved by each instructor for himself. He may take up, for instance, the leading doctrines of the Gospel in themselves, and follow them out in succession through its different parts; or he may trace back their antecedents in the Old Testament, and watch them as they expand in the writings of the Apostles and in the life of the early Church; or again, he may consider them in the light of their adaptation to the abiding needs of human nature, or to the special needs of the present day. Certain more salient parts of the Gospels, such as the miracles, the parables, the Sermon on the Mount and other discourses of our Lord might also be chosen and become the centre around which most of the other teachings of the Gospel could be gathered. But a consecutive explanation of any of the Gospels could hardly answer the present purpose. An elementary course cannot be a simple commentary.

2. A similar difficulty occurs in connection with the other writings of the New Testament. Some sort of Introduction has to be given to each one of them, but there is no time to study them in detail. Even the Epistles of St. Paul cannot be followed out consecutively, and hence the common practice of selecting the more important among them for class

work and leaving the others for private study. There is much to say in favor of such a method ; yet it is beset with a twofold danger: that of limiting practically the knowledge of St. Paul to the Epistles explained, and the knowledge of such Epistles to a discussion of their difficulties. Both may be averted by a careful Introduction to the life and genius of the Apostle and to each one of his writings. Something more effective still would be to substitute to the exegetical study of a few Epistles a thorough inquiry into the principal teachings of St. Paul, illustrated by passages taken indiscriminately from all his Epistles.

3. In the Old Testament (the historical books being already disposed of) what has always appealed most to the Christian mind is the Psalter. Upon the priest that wonderful collection of sacred hymns has a special claim, as supplying a considerable portion of his accustomed homage of prayer and of praise. Daily recitation of the Breviary renders him familiar with the letter of the Psalms ; careful study should make him not less acquainted with their meaning and their spirit. His teacher cannot, of course, be expected to take them up, one after the other. The most and best he can do is to give a key to them in the shape of an Introduction, bearing on their origin, compilation, etc., and on their leading aspects, doctrinal, devotional, literary, prophetic, all illustrated by examples gathered from every part of the Psalter.

4. Room has also to be made for the Prophets. Their place is too great in the religious, political and literary history of the chosen people to admit of their being neglected. At least a general study should be devoted to them, describing the exact nature and purposes of their mission, the part they played in the religious education of Israel, and the character of the books which bear their names.

5. Finally, the Sapiential Books should not be neglected. They form no small portion of Sacred Writ. They reflect the thoughts of the wisest among the Jewish people and help us to realize what God was pleased to show them of higher truth. They mark a special stage in that gradual evolution

of moral and religious knowledge ever growing among the chosen people until it reached its fulness in the teachings of Christ. But the professor can do little more than supply a general Introduction to the study.

V.

Such we conceive to be the extent of the ground which an instructor in Biblical science may find it possible to cover amid the various studies comprised in the seminary training. As in all else that is done in that period, the object of the work should be twofold; to assure a certain amount of necessary knowledge in the present, and, by awakening the curiosity of the aspirants and by developing their aptitude for Biblical study, to prepare them for subsequent efforts in the same direction. To effect both, and especially the latter, we venture to make the following recommendations:

1. It should be the constant aim of the professor to elicit from each student as much personal work as his capacity, or the time he can dispose of, may permit, to be pursued substantially on the lines already marked out. Let us suppose, for instance, that the subject of study is the 1st. Epistle to the Corinthians. The student should be induced to go over it several times by himself and note down in succession,

(*a*) the general purpose or purposes of the Epistle so far as they may be gathered from the text;
(*b*) its principal parts or divisions;
(*c*) its most striking passages;
(*d*) its chief difficulties, of expression or otherwise;
(*e*) an attempt to solve them without external help from commentaries.

Questions corresponding to these different points of view should be answered in class, *viva voce* or in writing, having been given out beforehand, v. g., in this shape:

(*a*) What is the purpose (manifold) of I. Cor. as gathered from its contents? Mention the passages from which the purpose is inferred.

(*b*) Point out the six most striking passages of the Epistle.
(*c*) Indicate its most important doctrines—its principal moral lessons.

It is easy to see how questions of this kind taken up in succession will absolutely compel the student to a close, repeated perusal of the Epistle, awaken his mind to its principal bearings and prepare him, in the best possible way, for the further instruction which the professor intends to impart. It may indeed be objected that such a preparation would require more time and more maturity of mind than can be commonly brought to it; but we confess our inability to believe that it is so. Certainly a student incapable of doing that sort of work after being shown how it is done, is unfit to study philosophy or theology. And, as regards the time, we will simply remark (*a*) that more time will have to be given to Biblical studies than in the past; (*b*) that what is needed is not so much additional time as concentration, method, and a possibility of spending, when needed, more time together on certain questions. For it must be remembered that while many kinds of work can be pursued amid a variety of interruptions, others demand lengthened, consecutive attention. A distinct view of the purpose and salient points of a book, for example, can hardly be got without going over it in a single sitting.

2. While thus calling forth the powers of the student and accustoming him to find out things for himself, the professor has to introduce him gradually to an intelligent use of books.

Books without number have been written on the Bible, as a whole, and on its every aspect and every part, so that it would seem as if there was room for nothing more. And yet each year supplies a fresh harvest of Biblical studies, many, as might be expected, of small or transient value, but many more offering original and useful elements, or a happier presentation of what was already known. It is important that the student should be made directly acquainted with what is best in the older and in the more modern productions on the subject. First, there are the Manuals or Intro-

ductions. Those in use among Catholics have been referred to above. They are comparatively few compared with those in use outside the Church; but they suffice abundantly to meet the requirements of the case, and besides, they may be supplemented by the others, the spirit and orthodoxy of several among them being almost faultless. The student should have one or several of these manuals always at hand. They will serve a threefold purpose: (*a*) to supply various kinds of information he constantly needs; (*b*) to test the accuracy of the conclusions he has reached by his own industry; (*c*) to recall, and occasionally to supplement, the teaching of his professor. The more familiar a student becomes with the contents of his manual, the easier and pleasanter the rest of his work will come to him.

Next there are the Commentaries. Commentaries serve nearly the same purposes as Introductions or Manuals. Only the shorter ones can be of much practical benefit to the beginner. Yet it is occasionally useful for present investigation to look into the greater ones, and, in view of future studies, it is desirable that they should be known otherwise than by hearsay. One always thinks more readily of, and takes up more confidently a work he has already handled.

Lastly, there are the books of reference; works of all kinds bearing directly or indirectly on the Bible and lighting up its dark or distant parts; works of history, of exploration, of travel, written in view of the Bible, or for other purposes, yet helping none the less effectively to understand some of its facts or features. In this latter shape the present age has added much to Biblical literature, and the student should not be left in ignorance of what is best and most helpful. His present work will be brightened up thereby, and a curiosity awakened which will lead him to continue in subsequent years what was thus so pleasantly begun.[1]

1 We give here the names of a certain number of books which will be found equally interesting and helpful to beginners and to advanced students:—

Abbé Vigouroux: *La Bible et les Découvertes Modernes.* (Many French editions,—a German translation.)

3. A last means of developing a knowledge of the Bible remains to be mentioned. It consists in giving special opportunities of study and special care to those who reveal a peculiar fitness for that branch of learning. After a short experience of his scholars, the professor will not fail to observe a certain number—it may be only a few—who exhibit a special aptitude for Biblical studies; a general love of the Bible and of things appertaining to it, such as ancient history, antiquities, languages, etc. These are the Bible students of the future, and from now they have to be equipped for it. Thus, besides the rudiments of Hebrew, which all are supposed to learn, (*a*) they might be more thoroughly grounded in Hebrew grammar and get some initiation, if possible, into the other Semitic languages; (*b*) a fuller knowledge might be given them of the modern methods of investigation, v. g., in textual and higher criticism; (*c*) they should also be introduced to some of the latest, best ascertained and most interesting results reached by the application of these methods; (*d*) occasions should be found to make them do a little original work of the kind with which they have thus become acquainted. To have worked under a master on a few subjects properly selected

H. A. Harper: *The Bible and Modern Discoveries.*
Geikie: *The Bible Lands. Hours with the Bible.* (Harper and Geikie follow closely on the lines of Vigouroux.)
Thompson: *The Land and the Book.*
Van Lennep: *Bible Lands.*
Conder: *Handbook to the Bible. Tent Work in Palestine.*
Palmer: *The Desert of the Exodus. The Negeb.*
Porter: *Five Years in Damascus. A Guide Book of Syria and Palestine,* etc.
Stanley: *Sinai and Palestine: Lectures on the Jewish Church.*
Wilkinson: *The Ancient Egyptians.*
Lane: *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians.*
Rawlinson (Canon Geo.): *The Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World—Egypt and Babylon,* etc.
Layard: *Nineveh and its Remains.—Babylon and Nineveh.*
Geo. Smith: *Assyrian Discoveries.*
Victor Guérin: *La Terre Sainte.*
Sayce: *The Higher Criticism and the Monuments.*
Rev. H. J. Heuser: *Chapters on Bible Study,* etc., etc.

will enable the student to handle judiciously many others when he meets them later on, and teach him where to look for the most reliable and helpful information.

To accomplish this nothing can be better than to form the students to whom we refer into a special association similar to those which are known in European schools under the name of "Academies" or "Seminären." These organizations are established in connection with each branch of study, their object being chiefly to train students to original work under the guidance of a master. They are better suited for universities than for seminaries, yet there is unquestionably room for them in the latter, and, properly conducted, they would prove the most effective stimulant to personal effort and the best training for the work of future years of which it will remain for us to speak on a later occasion.

J. HOGAN.

St. John's Seminary, Brighton.

SACERDOTALISM IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

AGAINST "sacerdotalism," as such, I do not suppose any professing Christian can have any serious objection. The Levitical priesthood must be acknowledged as a divine institution; and so there can be nothing intrinsically wicked in the intermediation of man between God and man in certain matters. Nor should those who deny the legitimacy of the sacerdotal system forget that it is precisely *as man* that Christ is the mediator or priest of the New Law: "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, *the man* Christ Jesus." So that even if we allow in some sense the substitution of one priest after the type of Melchizedech for

the many priests of the Old Law, still the sacerdotal principle of human mediation is saved whole and entire. Needless to say, Christ *as God* could not be called a mediator between man and God; though *as man* He can mediate between God and *the rest of* mankind. Hence to repudiate sacerdotalism on the score that Christianity gives no direct access to God without the mediation of man is implicitly to betray an ignorance of the doctrine of Christ's priesthood. No doubt, even that doctrine ill accords with the individualistic genius of Protestantism, which demands absolute spiritual independence for each, and direct and immediate contact with the Divinity. Each is to be taught by private and particular inspiration as to what is true and what is right. Each is sufficient for himself. If he is associated with others in any corporate way, it is only as business men are associated in a joint stock company, where each is zealous for the common good only so far as it redounds to his *private* gain. That is his ultimate end. The whole company of his associates are but means to that end. The bond that unites them is individual self-interest. So it is that all sectarian bodies look upon some kind of Church or organized Congregation as a necessary and helpful *means* to the separate good of each individual composing it. Just as for educational or civil or military purposes men gain by banding together, so for the purpose of religious instruction, mutual edification, encouragement, coöperation in good works. Few see far enough into things to notice the absolute and substantial difference between such congregationalism and the Catholic conception of the Church as Christ's Mystical Body, whose members are united to God, not individually and directly, but through and with one another; and all collectively through Christ their Head; in such sort that the end and beatitude of each member consists not in its own isolated and subjective well-being and perfection, but in that of the whole Mystic Body. For in the Catholic conception, our first and chiefest perfection is that which belongs to us precisely *as members* of a body; and to this end our individual or particular perfection is secondary and subordinate, though inseparably identified

with it. The Protestant conception is precisely the converse; and accords well with the philosophic division of entity into God, Self, and Creation, where all other personalities are crowded under the heading of creatures, or means to lead me to God, and which are to be wholly subordinated in my estimate to my own individual end; even as I, in their estimate, am to be subordinated to their end. Indeed, though few perceive or allow it, even God Himself is in this system viewed as *my* good, and as in some sort a *means* or instrument to my perfection and beatitude—so supreme and central a place is accorded to self by individualism, in philosophy and religion. For if everything be loved because in some way it belongs to me or is related to me, it is plain that self is loved more than all; even more than God.

It is then merely as a *means* to his private spiritual well-being that the Protestant avails himself of the advantages offered by associations for religious interests. The congregation to which he belongs does not come between him and God in any way, so as to make his relation to God dependent at all upon that of his fellow-members to God. The fact that they are nearer or further, does not really affect his position. Rather, as he himself mediates between inanimate nature and God, so also between his co-religionists and God; they, being like any other creature in his regard, *i. e.*, intended to return to God and give glory *through him* inasmuch as he uses them as means to his own private spiritual end. But where the corporate and Pauline conception of the Mystic Church is once grasped, we see that individualist independence is altogether excluded, and that it is only through, and in conjunction with Christ and His brethren, with the Head and with our fellow-members, that we have access to the Father; that the Law of Christ requires that we should bear one another's burdens as He has borne ours; that none should live for himself, or consider his own concerns but the concerns of others; that if one member suffers or rejoices all the rest should suffer or rejoice with it; that we should stand or fall together, being bound together as one body by one spirit, and no longer independent. This is the notion that human

pride or self-assertion revolts against and which reason and Christian revelation alike insist upon. For when Charity[1] *i. e.*, the spirit of Christ, is duly developed in the heart, the final good and bliss at which each one aims is the universal good of the whole body whereof his own particular well-being is but a fraction. So far as any other unit fails of perfection so far the general end or good is minished of its fulness; and it is the loss and sorrow of every heart in which the fire of charity burns; even as the bliss of each adds to the bliss of all.

Hence it is that we depend upon one another; and stand or fall together—not, of course, as though if one were lost all were lost; or if one were saved, all were saved; but in as far as the degree of corporate joy in store for the Church Triumphant is lowered or raised by every action of every member of the Church Militant. Doubtless each individual is glorified in proportion to his individual works; but this individual glory is but an element in that universal glory, wherein his joy principally resides. It is this conception of the solidarity of mankind, both in the natural and the supernatural order, which is at the root of the mediatorial and sacerdotal system; and the denial of which excludes (logically though not actually) even the mediation of Christ, understood in the Catholic and sacerdotal sense. Thus we see in those acts in which the individualist or Protestant idea is more clearly and fully developed, Christ's function is reduced to that of a preternaturally enlightened teacher and example of the higher morality; and even if His Divinity is admitted, it only adds to the weight of His example and authority, but in no way changes the nature of His office. It is precisely as Head of His Mystical Body that He is priest and mediator between God and His subordinated members of whom none has access to the Father, individually and independently, but only *formally as* a member of Christ; *formally as* subordinated to Him; *formally as* part of that whole

1 Charity and Hope both love God above all things. But Hope regards Him as our own sovereign subjective good: whereas Charity loves Him as the sovereign objective good.

whereof He is the Head or principal part. This is what Catholic dogma means by salvation through union with Christ by faith and charity. With Protestants the phrase means that Christ as a divinely sent teacher and example, ministers to individual souls and helps them to unite themselves *directly* and independently to the Father. Each single soul in itself is, so to say, an independent world to be redeemed and saved, nor is the measure of its beatitude in any way dependent on the sanctification and salvation of other souls. *Quisque sibi vivit* is the Protestant conception; *Nemo sibi vivit*, the Catholic.

And as the conception of Christ's office differs, so does that of the function of His ministers. To the Protestant the minister is but a teacher, an animated book. He mediates between the soul and God only as the Bible does, or as any other created help, or as Christ Himself, in His office of Teacher of teachers; but no human or created *will* intervenes as a condition of his own approaches to God being accepted. Yet this is the essential idea of mediation and priesthood, whether by way of sacrifice or intercessory prayer. An illiterate person dictates his petition to a scribe, or delivers it to a messenger *viva voce*. Neither scribe nor messenger is a mediator; they intervene as mere instruments of conveyance. But the intercessor pleads his own merits, official or personal, and by entreaty or by offering demands that the favor accorded to him be extended to those who belong to him, and who make one moral personality with him, as the members do with the head. Such intervention as this is repudiated by the Protestant principle of religious individualism. The congregational minister in his extempore prayer does not intervene in virtue of any official or personal title, between the people and God. He is, theoretically, but their delegate, who is supposed by a certain fiction to speak in the name and according to the mind of all, but not to make intercession for the people. He simply leads the prayer of the congregation, just as the precentor leads their praise. As a matter of fact the use of set forms is far more consistent with such a theory than the practice of extempore

prayer. Still as a parliamentary representative is supposed simply to interpret and express the minds of his constituents —thus differing from the delegate who is little more than a messenger—so perhaps there is something to be said for the institutions of similar representatives of the popular mind before the tribunal of God. Of course it may be that no Christian sect is explicitly conscious of this principle at work, and allows much that is wholly inconsistent with it, though in keeping with the dictates of reason and faith. In the mere praying for one another; in the profession of redemption through the merits of Christ, the whole sacerdotal and social principle is already admitted. And indeed human nature is too strong to suffer its complete and consistent exclusion; for though revelation tells us of a higher and supernatural incorporation of all men into one body, yet even reason tells us that we are members one of another and that none is self-sufficient. Not until pseudo-individualism has killed out every spark of sympathy and unselfish love, will a man be able to say that even his temporal happiness or sorrow is in no way dependent on the happiness and sorrow of others, and therefore upon the free will of others. To rejoice with them that rejoice and to weep with them that weep is the deepest instinct of the soul; and in its development lies our beatitude, for it is nothing else but the instinct of charity. Shut up in its own isolation the heart withers away for lack of that universal object for which it was created, namely, the spiritual world of humanity with the "Father of Spirits" as its Head Centre and Bond. Look at it how we will, we find that the end whose realization is our final bliss depends for its fulness of attainment not upon our will alone, but on every other created will; and that therefore the spiritual self-sufficiency and independence of Protestantism is alien both to reason and faith.

Catholic Christianity has for this reason always recognized the value of intercession, whether based on personal or on official claims. This distinction of claims is natural and is observed in human society. Often one who has no official standing or dignity will on the score of friendship have great

intercessory power with those in authority. Conversely, when all such personal claims are absent mere official position will entitle one to be heard. Similarly in the Church "the effectual fervent prayer of a just man availeth much," and therefore we have recourse to the intercession of the saints living and dead. But over and above this we have an official intercessor in the person of Christ our great High Priest, whose prayer and sacrifice is applied in our behalf by His vicars, the priests of the Church.

We may now consider a little more closely the precise character of priestly intervention as distinguished from other forms of intercession both official and personal.

"Every priest," says the Scripture, "taken from among men is appointed in behalf of men in matters pertaining to God, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sin. . . Nor does any man arrogate to himself this honor, but he who is called by God as was Aaron. So also Christ did not glorify himself with the priesthood; but He who spake to Him: 'Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten Thee;' as also elsewhere He saith: 'Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedeck.'" (Heb. v.)

If we trace the line along which the notion of priesthood has developed among various nations it will seem that the idea is of later birth than that of sacrifice, and originates as soon as the need is felt of a representative or mediator between the suppliant and the deity. This need may have two very different explanations. It may be created by sin which makes the offender's services and offerings unacceptable, and requires the intercession of a *persona grata* who has the interests of both sides at heart, or it may be due simply to formation of social groups of ever increasing complexity—families, tribes, nations, federations and so forth, each of which has a corporate life and interest, and requires the deputation of some representative for the offering of gifts and sacrifices in behalf of the whole community. It has been fairly maintained that in primitive society the heir and first born was in some way the representative and mediator of the rest of the household in respect to the father or head.

It was on him the paternal blessing descended and upon the rest only through him, and as united with him. When Jacob became the heir, it meant that Esau was to serve him. "Be thou lord of thy brethren," says Isaac to him, "and let the children of thy mother bow down before thee;" and to Esau it was said: "Thou shalt serve thy brother." (Gen. xxvii.) In virtue of this secondary headship, the first-born naturally held an intermediary position in the primitive family. The same specialization would set apart the paterfamilias as representative of the entire household in respect to the tribe; and so of other more complex groupings. The extension of the family idea to man's relations with the deity would endow the political ruler of each group with a priestly function or mediatorial office in matters religious. Hence arose the primitive confusion of prophet (or divine legate), priest and king in one and the same person; who was a father in relation to his subjects, and yet a son in relation to the deity, the common Father or Patron of all. Subsequent evolution puts these various functions into commission, although in the archetype we find them again reunited in the one person of Christ. All our certain knowledge of primitive civilizations tends to confirm the view according to which all natural social evolution is but the development of the family idea; and which infers that when man enters into communion with beings of the other world his social relations with them are conceived analogously and governed by similar methods.

The peculiar function of a priest as such is to offer gifts, and sin-offerings in behalf of others. He is a mediator whose mediation consists in sacrifice. The preparation of the food; the procuring and slaying of the victim; the manufacture of the bread and the wine, do not necessarily belong to the priest as is evident from many of the Levitical sacrifices. His work is the work of offering or presentation. To offer is to manifest externally our will to resign ownership in favor of another, which transfer of dominion takes place, if on the other side acceptance is signified. Now the external manifestation on both sides is a matter of convention. The ceremonies of contracts and quasi-contracts are

as multiple and diverse as the tongues of men. To look for any natural and necessary sign of offering is as futile as a search for the natural and primitive language. Perhaps the universal instinct of mankind favors a double sign, addressed to the eye and the ear—a symbolic action, coupled with a form of words; as we find in all primitive contract ceremonies; in many of those of the present day; and in the Sacraments of the Catholic religion, as well as in those of some non-Christian religions.

It is not of necessity that the gifts offered should be received by the priest from the people, provided they be offered in behalf of the people—though in such a case they are, by a sort of fiction, the offerings of the people who are represented by the priest.

What is true of sacrifice, is also true of priesthood, namely that if we want to get at the notion of its purity we must be careful not to import into it those peculiarities of the Levitical priesthood which were chiefly prophetic of the Messianic anti-type.

The Epistle to the Hebrews deals very explicitly with the priesthood of Christ, the archetype of all priesthood; the substance, whereof Aaron's priesthood was the shadow; the reality after which the nations were groping in vain. There it is contrasted with Aaronic and ethnic types respectively—the latter taken at its highest development in Melchizedech. It is to our purpose to notice that, it is precisely in virtue of His Sonship that Christ is chosen to be the Priest of humanity. He is represented to us then as the "First-born of many brethren;" as "the man" *par* excellence; the second Adam; as the Son of God by hypostatic union, even as we are by adoption. At the same time His primogeniture gives Him a right of headship, and makes Him the father of redeemed humanity, even as Adam was our father, and yet our brother-man and the son of our common Father in heaven. In virtue of His Divinity, as Son of God, *the man* Christ has access to the Father, and through Him we have access. He is at once our father and head, and our elder brother, the first-born of humanity and indeed, of all

creation. Thus we read that He was divinely consecrated priest by the same act which made Him the Son of God, namely, by the unction of the Divinity wherewith the humanity was exalted in the moment of the Incarnation: "Christ did not glorify himself to become a priest; but He who spake to Him: Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee." (Heb. v., 5.) Again He is spoken of as "a great high priest set over the house of God" (x., 21), his priesthood being thus connected with His headship over the family of God's Church; as also in c. iii., where in contrast with Moses He is spoken of as a *son* in the house of God, "which house are we." Again in c. ii., He is numbered among the "many sons" (multos filios) of God, as the author of their salvation for "he that sanctifies,"[1] "and they that are sanctified are all from one. Wherefore he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying I will announce thy name to my *brethren* . . . Behold me and the *children* which God hath given me." Plainly then it is as the Son of God and as our elder brother and head that Christ is the natural mediator between us and the Heavenly Father and by His Sacrifice restores us to sonship and to our place at that Father's table to be fed from His hand with the daily bread of angels.

Also as the anti-type of Melchizedeck, king and priest, our Lord's priesthood is shown to be intimately bound up with His kingship; and we see that it is as head and ruler of the race, that He is our natural representative and mediator before God. The same psalm which proclaims Him a priest after the type of Melchizedeck presents Him to us as the universal monarch: "virgam virtutis tuae emittet Dominus ex Sion; dominare in medio inimicorum tuorum. . . . Judicabit in nationibus; implebit ruinas; conquassabit capita in terra multorum."

The preëminence of Christ's priesthood is quite analogous or rather parallel with that of His Sacrifice. As all sacrifices ethnic and Levitical were but imperfect shadowings of that

1 Cf. Jo. xvii. "For their sakes I sanctify myself," where the word refers to propitiatory sacrifice.

of Calvary, so all the notes of priesthood are verified super-excellently in the perfect priesthood of Christ. This is the theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews. If the Aaronic priesthood was transitory, Christ's is eternal. If the Levitical priests were many because death ended their office, Christ is the undying priest. If they sacrificed again and again owing to the insufficiency of their gifts, Christ sacrificed once and for all. If their victims justified merely as symbols of a reality, His victim was the reality signified and believed in. If their self-subjection was signified vicariously by a food-offering, Christ was Himself the Bread of Life and the Food offered. If they were appointed mediators between God and Israel, Christ was mediator between God and humanity. As to the manner of offering, there is a difference between the life-sacrifice of Christ and His Eucharistic sacrifice. With regard to the former His priestly office began with His Incarnation—"Hodie genui te"—and received its completion (τελείωσιν) on Calvary. His self-tradition began with the "exinanitio" whereby he emptied Himself of His glory and took on Himself the form of a slave; and was perfected when His obedience to the precept of love was carried to the extent of dying for us on the cross. "Greater love hath no man than this." As regards the Eucharist, we may hold that there too He gave Himself once and for all in the cenacle; that there He virtually received into His hands every host that shall ever be consecrated; every chalice that shall ever be blessed, and said to all who shall ever receive them: "Take and eat, this is my body; drink ye of this for this is my blood;" that then and there the *fiat* went forth from Him in virtue of which every trans-substantiation takes place, on the rehearsal of those words by His delegates. At all events it is by one and the same act that He becomes sacramental food and offers Himself as such to the Father for our feeding. At every Eucharist therefore He, either virtually or actually, offers sacrifice by the instrumentality of the Christian priest. We say virtually or actually, for it matters little whether we regard each Eucharist as the term of a distinct volition or as together with all the rest the effect of one volition with a

multiple term. In either case it is Christ who gives and offers; and each is virtually if not actually a distinct offering. It matters little whether a man by one act gives alms to twenty; or by twenty acts. In both cases there are twenty donations. If we view all Eucharists as the terms of one act of giving, then indeed we include them more obviously in the great self-tradition of Christ's life-sacrifice, whereof the effects are applied to future generations without any new self-tradition. It is as though He consecrated hosts for the whole world to be reserved and distributed to the end of time. This opens up the question as to the nature and functions of the priesthood of the Catholic Church.

St. Paul or the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews dwells much on the contrast between the multiplicity of the Levitical priests and sacrifices and the oneness of Christ's priesthood and sacrifice. In this respect too Christ is a priest after the type of Melchizedeck who was alone and isolated; without ancestor or progeny, in a sense eternal, without beginning or end of days; and of whom but one offering is recorded, and that an offering of bread and wine. It is indeed the Catholic doctrine that the Christian priest is but an instrumental cause, and not the principle cause of the sacrifice which he offers; that he speaks but as the mouthpiece of Christ; that he only conditions an effect which is the work of God himself. It is Christ who baptizes, who confirms, who ordains, who consecrates. This is an important distinction worth being clear about. In the ministry of the word the preacher is a secondary, but still a principal cause—not a mere instrument. Were he a mere delegate sent to repeat the words of another, as a written letter might do, he would be simply the instrument of the sender. But as a preacher he is a representative, and not a delegate. The effect he products is *ex opere operantis*. Not so in the ministry of the Sacraments. Here the effect is *ex opere operato*. Christ alone is the principal cause; the minister is but the determining condition. If a man of wealth undertakes to pay whatever debt his son may contract with tradesmen, the son in giving them a check on his father's bank

does not pay them himself out of money which is his, but simply as an instrumental cause. *Practically* it is the same as though he possessed the money himself; and so it is *practically* the same as though the priest possessed the power of Christ. It is no mean trust, no small dignity to be left free to determine how and when the effects of Christ's power shall be dispensed. Still it is not comparable to the dignity of Christ who alone possesses that power inherently. The priest is therefore the "steward and dispenser," but not the creator or owner of Christ's treasures and of the fruits of His Passion. Once and for all Christ offered himself in His life and death to be the Bread of man's immortal life; and included in that offering was the gift at the Last Supper when as far as He was concerned He consecrated every Eucharist to the end of time and gave every host that was ever to be received, leaving it to His ministers to determine the when, and the where, and the how-often. Christ is therefore the Consecrator at every mass—not perhaps in virtue of a new utterance but at least in virtue of the old words echoed down from two thousand years ago. Those words were and are the true cause; their rehearsal over the sacred elements is but the determining condition of their efficacy. Is *this* mass then a new sacrifice? It is only a question of words. This mass was offered by Christ in the cenacle, together with that and every other mass. Each is a distinct giving of Himself, a distinct sacrifice; though each is a part of that total self-tradition which began with His conception and ended with His death. When the prince gives the order for an execution he has punished the crime as far as he is concerned. But between the order and its effects many steps and much time intervene. When at last the sword falls it is the prince who slays. So with a deed of gift. In the cenacle Christ, so to say, signed the bond for every self-giving that He foresaw to the end of time. So far then as gift and sacrifice is an act of volition He sacrificed then and there; though as regards the actual carrying out of His bequest, and the *material* giving of Himself by trans-substantiation, His continual physical concurrence is needed and guaranteed.

Great and mysterious as is the dignity of the Christian priest, yet in some sense he falls short of the Levitical or pre-Levitical priest, in that his priesthood is purely vicarious. The Levitical priest offered on each occasion an independent sacrifice; and he offered it in his own right, not as the "instrument" or "*manus*" of some other priest. He was not acting simply in name of Aaron, or as carrying out his will. Whereas Christ is the one priest of the New Law and His sacrifice though consisting of many parts is but one. The priests of the Church though many in time and place are, as it were, but the sacraments or outward signs of one, whose Eternal Priesthood is, in them, determined to all differences of time and place; so that He is with His Church in all nations and in all days even to the end of the world. And their sacrifices are but parts of that great Sacrifice and Self-giving of His which they apply to their fore-ordained destinations. They are bearers of gifts despatched from the cenacle. *They* give them, and *He* gives them; but He is the principal giver; they, instrumental. Yet absolutely speaking it is a greater dignity to be the instrumental cause of a sacrifice of infinite value than to be the principal cause of a sacrifice of finite value.

Such is the relation of the Christian priest to Christ. What is his relation to the Body of Christ, His Bride, the visible Catholic Church?

Christ in giving Himself for our Food in obedience to the Father's precept of love, thereby offers Himself first to the Father. Hence a double benefit to us, one sacrificial, the other sacramental. The sacrificial act is one of praise and thanksgiving and propitiation and impetration. But Head and Body are one, and the action of either is attributable to both. The Self-offering of Christ her Head, in every mass, is also the action of the whole visible Church, His Body. And on the same principle all the acts of praise, thanksgiving, reparation and prayer performed by the Church officially and by the faithful singly are attributable to that same totality—Christ and the Church. Therefore whenever and wherever, through the instrumentality of her ministers she

celebrates mass, there Holy Church puts herself under Christ her Head, and makes His offering her own, and unites with it her public and official prayers, praises and offerings; while the faithful who are present also bring their contributions and identify themselves in this august sacrifice with Christ and His Church. The priests therefore are the instruments whereby the offerings of the universal Church through all ages and countries are united to and blended with the Eucharist sacrifices of her Head, and through whom the filling up of what is wanting to the fulness of His Passion is accomplished. The priest has therefore at the altar, a three-fold personality. He is Christ: he is the Church: he is himself. And he offers a threefold sacrifice: that of Christ; that of the Church; that of himself. Christ in His priests gives Himself to the Father for the Bread of man's life and the service of man. The Church in her priests gives herself to the Father for the service of Christ; and the priest himself, like the rest of the faithful, gives himself for the service of the Church.

G. TYRRELL, S.J.

Stonyhurst College, England.

THE "CRUX" OF THE PRIESTLY LIFE.

NOT many years ago the pastor of a prosperous congregation in one of our Eastern dioceses proposed to a young priest to act as *locum tenens* during his absence for a few summer months. The offer was one which under ordinary circumstances should have proved an attraction to an exemplary and zealous priest, such as this one was. The locality was healthy and beautiful; the affairs of the parish were in excellent condition; and the work not too exacting to absorb the time which one might wish to give to study and recreation. But the young priest was not disposed to

accept the offer, and deprecated the mention of his name to the Ordinary as a possible candidate for the position. "I have my hopes," he added, "and I would rather be the last assistant in the poorest city parish than pastor of the finest church in the country." He dreaded to have the Bishop suppose that he liked or was satisfied with extra-urban life, and appoint him to some country parish. On another occasion a rural pastor whom I congratulated upon his delightful home, pretty church and more than usually flourishing parish, said: "There is not a single pastor outside N. and N. (two large cities) who would not resign to-morrow if he was offered the poorest assistancy in those towns." Even if such a statement were not to be taken literally, there is no doubt that in many places the country pastors look upon translation to an assistantship in the city as a promotion. Not to waste space in reciting instances, some of them very droll, some profoundly tragical, and with which most of us are quite familiar, let us rather ask:

What is the reason of all this?

I think it is the lonesomeness of life in the country, more especially where those of the priest's social class are not of his faith. "It is not good for man to be alone" (Gen. ii., 18); but a priest is a man; therefore . . . . Although what I have to say applies especially to the rural clergy, much of it concerns those city assistants who, perhaps because parish work is not properly organized, sometimes pass entire days alone in their rooms waiting for the sick-call that never comes, and are naturally desperate, knowing not what to do, feeling the need of employment and the sin and danger of idleness, yet powerless to help themselves, and longing for the hour when they may meet their brethren again at table, or be free to visit members of the cloth or other persons. This lonesomeness is especially felt by social natures, and by active, building, organizing characters, when their church, house and school are completed. Such men will have no vocation in the future, where there is no more such work to be done. In that day the churchmen will be such as will be content to stay still and watch, like the

shepherd's dog, "easie not idle"; the hounds will join the missionary orders.

"There is in the heart of man a law requiring companionship with fellow-man, and do what he will, he can neither alter nor ignore it." (Alzog, I., 145.) "Naturam expellas furca," says Horace, "tamen usque recurrit."

I heard a prominent member of a regular order say that the lonely life of a priest in a country town even, was enough to wreck the brain of the healthiest man. These regulars fly to the orders because they do not feel strong enough to live alone; and even these orders seem to prefer the large cities. Is it not so? Very few men indeed are called to be hermits, and even the Carthusians, forbidden by their rule to speak, have the consciousness of the neighborhood of their brethren, and can converse with these when their state of mind needs aid and counsel. What a healthy, what a holy, what a necessary provision of the rule!

Shallow people wonder sometimes at the breaking down of the solitary diocesan priest, and there are found those who do not understand his circumstances, and could not bear up under them themselves for seven days, and yet are rash enough to cry out on him.

Experto crede. He is a rock of sense or a saint, who can keep his wits and an unsullied conscience if compelled to live that way.

What is the remedy?

But some one will say: "Has he not his daily Mass?" He has, and here the loneliness makes itself felt, on account of the fewness of the worshippers; and frequently the total want of these makes it "not worth while" to heat the church during the six or seven cold months. The first time I ever said Mass without a witness was in such a place, and I feel the chill to this day. "But if he had Mass every day and a comfortable chapel the people would come." Perhaps one or two persons might, but, you see, he goes away to escape the loneliness.

"Has he not his people to visit?" He sees most of them sufficiently often on Saturdays and Sundays, or casually

during the week. The farmers and their wives, etc., don't care about the priest's visiting, as a rule, except when they are ready to receive, that is, after supper at night, or preferably on Sunday afternoon. At these times the priest cannot go, for he must stay at home in order to receive those who call on him, precisely because they are then free. Besides, once in three months is quite often enough to pay pastoral visits, and at this rate the whole thing can be accomplished in a few days.

"Can't he hold Sodality and Society meetings?" Yes, on Sundays, but not during the week.

"Can't he hear Confessions?" Yes, for two hours on Saturday. The people won't come oftener, nor at any other time. "Why doesn't he prepare his sermons?" He knows by experience that the instruction most intelligible and useful to these people is a pastoral "talk" on the simple duties of their daily lives. I heard a priest (not of my own race) say once, apropos of a certain sky-scraping orator, that he "couldn't understand all he said himself, but that it was good sometimes to soar so high that you got 'out of sight;' it made the people say: 'What a grand preacher that is! We can't tell what he's talking about, it's so high;' and thus their respect for the Church and her doctrine is increased." I didn't agree with him. One or two hours of immediate preparation is abundant for our lonely pastor's Sunday sermon, the points of which he has been meditating on his walks for perhaps several days.

"Can't he deliver Sunday evening discourses?" Not in the rural districts. "But he can in the town." If he is a remarkable preacher, perhaps. The people tire of hearing the same man, and he of the same audience. I am convinced that even Father Tom Burke wouldn't draw for more than a limited time. The regular orders can do this, because they have different preachers every time, or, at least, other priests to say Mass, sing Vespers, etc., and are thus not completely exhausted on Sunday night.

"But he can visit the sick." Bless you, there are very few or none sick in the country! I have known an assistant

there pray for sick-calls to relieve the dull blank of his existence. For though the case of the lonely pastor is bad enough, that of an assistant in the country is far worse and positively dangerous.

"He has a parish-school,"—perhaps. If so, he can visit it once or possibly twice a week for an hour or so. It will exhaust his magnetism to go oftener (unless he become a teacher, something of questionable expediency), and will not be good for the children.

Those that read this familiar screed may, will, I hope, suggest other ways by which the country pastor may employ his time. I know of visiting other priests and what it ordinarily or frequently implies, but do not think well of it at all. Any how, even with all the pastoral work suggested, most country priests will find time hang heavy very often.

What is to be done?

An excellent plan for some priests would be an engagement to lecture once a week in some institution of learning. Indeed I don't know a more appropriate one for some; it is the ideal one for them; but they are the very, very few, and where will these few get such a job? As for studying systematically without some such object, writing for newspapers, a book, etc., it is out of the question for the general. No man, as a rule, can study unless he has to preach or to teach or to pass an examination. "But there are the Conferences twice a year." Yes, these could be counted on for two or three days' application, and the assistant might study for a month to prepare for his annual examination. What shall the lonely priest do? "Read the daily papers?" What a lot of valuable power to cultivate and love the True, the Beautiful and Good is wasted on those papers! What a splendid amount of will is frittered away, and brain weakened to the brink of inanity by such reading! Even the one who has the happy taste and habit of healthy reading needs change and relief. He is not the one we have in mind however. "Indulge in athletic sports?" A little private gymnastics is good for spiritual, mental and bodily health in the crowded city, perhaps, but a walk in the fresh air is

better. Billiards, cards, etc., with a friend, for a little while, very rarely, can be excused, if not recommended. As for killing time with them! No, they will kill you if you practise them for that object.

Some manual occupation is what is wanted.

Occupation is company. The regular orders in their novitiates have a period of each day for manual occupation, —would to God the seminaries could imitate them!—some even teaching trades that not only help to support the house, but prepare the future missionary to maintain himself, if needs be, or at least to occupy himself usefully. I knew two priests who had learned carpentry, and who saved the people's money, busying themselves in the pious work of repairing their churches. A man called to see Bishop Whelan, of Wheeling, one day. "There he is putting up the cross, sir," was the reply; and in fact there he was, two hundred feet in the air, doing a piece of skilled masonry for which he claimed the right as Bishop, or would spare the married mechanics the risk to their lives in the doing. Priests intended for African and Chinese missions study medicine, a thing likely to employ their own time and aid in converting the heathen. The "monks of old" always united labor to prayer. Their device was: *laborare est orare* (Fathers of the Desert). In this they but followed the example of the Apostles, who supported themselves by the work of their hands. Listen to St. Paul: "I have not coveted any man's gold, silver or apparel, as you yourselves know; for such things as were needful for me, and them that are with me, these hands have furnished." (Acts xx., 24.)

How did they furnish? "And because he was of the same trade, he remained with them and wrought: now they were tent-makers by trade. And he reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath," etc. (Acts xviii., 3.) Our Lord Himself, the Son of Him who made the world and man, chose to be known for a carpenter. "Is not this the carpenter, the Son of Mary?" (St. Mark vi., 3.) It is true He does not appear to have worked constantly at His trade during His missionary career, nor need the country pastor do so either, if he have

the grace to enter upon such a becoming and glorious life. We have in mind those who feel no inclination or see no opening for the conversion of non-Catholics, those of whom a bishop sadly said: "I can't find any who are willing to do mission-work outside the fold." I suggest, therefore, some manual labor for this poor country pastor while he is waiting —waiting, what a pity to confess it!—for an assistantship, perhaps, in the episcopal city. I wonder if the same state of affairs did not exist in the flourishing African Church fifteen hundred years ago. At any rate, here is what we read in the Fourth Council of Carthage, A. D. 398, Canon 52: "Clericus victum et vestitum sibi artificiolo vel agricultura, absque officii sui detrimento paret." Canon 53: "Omnes clerici qui ad operandum validiores sunt, et artificiola et litteras discant." So, as Alzog says, vol. i., p. 658: "There were bishops and priests and deacons, who, following the advice of the Fourth Council of Carthage, earned their livelihood by the labor of their hands; there were, however, many occupations and professions specified which the clergy were not permitted to enter upon." "Artificiolum" seems to mean some little craft or occupation requiring skill, maybe drawing, or cabinet-making, or clock-mending, or book-binding, or what you will.

"Agricultura," the cultivation of the soil, the occupation of Adam, called by our own Washington the most proper occupation for Adam's sons. I knew a country pastor once who seemed to be failing in health. "If you would only turn up the airth, father," said a venerable parishioner, "there's great vartue in the smell of the upturned sile." In fact the Sulpicians in their "Manuel de Piété," suggest this for priests, saying that the care of a little garden is a becoming and useful employment for them. Doubtless rural priests are meant: for where would the city men find the "little garden?" Indeed the healthiest and best preserved pastor I know is a country one, who has always interested and busied himself in this way, and to-day in the forty-fifth year of his ministry is mentally and physically a model for his juniors, looking and talking and acting, and evidently

feeling, as if he were thirty-five instead of nearly twice that age. (I might add that he is a total abstainer.) Another friend of mine excellently well preserved, is chaplain to a large institution in a remote spot. In order that his bodily faculties may have needed exercise he has a lathe and various carpenter's tools, and mends all the chairs, etc., of the establishment, being thus supplied with quite enough employment of a various and not exhaustive character, to which, when tired of brain-work, he turns with great gusto and quickly finds the desired relief. The exercise of manual skill is required to preserve the *mens sana in corpore sano.*

If it added anything to my argument, I might quote the Talmud, the Jewish commentary on the Old Testament and repository of their traditions. All rabbis had a trade by which they supported themselves. Whether it is so to-day I know not. Probably those in the large cities live like the Gentile clergy. My inquiry, however, is how to provide occupation that is company for the celibate country pastor. The usefulness of manual labor may be confirmed therefore from what the old Jews thought of it. "It is well to add a trade to your studies," says the Talmud; "you will then be free from sin;" "Labor prevents an abject worship of learning;" and "The tradesman at his work need not rise before the greatest doctor." Let this suffice. It may be of interest to add that the princes of the German reigning families all learn trades (so I read somewhere), whether in order to be ready for a change of fortune, or to fill up idle and heavy-hanging time, or *to complete the education of the whole man*, I cannot say; but these three reasons are sound ones, and the last is extremely and deeply suggestive. All of which is respectfully submitted, in the hope that my clerical brethren will take up this very weighty and pressing subject, and give their views upon it.

EDWARD MCSWEENY.

Mt. St. Mary's.

MUNERUM A REGULARIBUS ACCEPTORUM RETENTIO.

CASUS MORALIS.

Bertha a quodam Religioso pluries in finem minime honestum accepit munera, quorum summa quingenta dollaria longe excedit. Id nuper ad conscientiae quietem recuperandam in confessione exposuit Pancratio, qui eam post hebdomadam redire jubens interim quaerit: 1 An Bertha teneatur restituere? 2 An, si Bertha restituere potest, eam ante restitutionem realiter factam possit absolvere?

Resp. Ad 1mum. Munera a Religioso in malum finem data debere restitui, cuique illucet, qui considerat, Religiosos per votum paupertatis fieri inhabiles ad actum dominii seu independentis de quavis re pretio aestimabili dispositionis exercendum, nec eis favere posse permissionem quantumvis generalem Superioris, si agitur de dispositione ad malum finem, cum nec Superior habeat rerum ad conventum pertinentium dominium, sed administrationem tantum in bonum Religionis faciendam. Quare evidens est, Bertham res a Religioso sibi donatas non fecisse suas, ideoque teneri restituere, et quidem earum domino, *i. e.*, conventui, ad quem Religiosus pertinebat, non vero Religioso, a quo ea accepit, uti hoc decidit Clemens VIII., in const. mox citanda.

Ad 2dum. Negative. Nam licet eam possit absolvere, si jam restituit aut impotens nunc restituendi serio promittit, sese restituturam esse quam primum id sibi fuerit possibile, Pancratius jurisdictione caret Bertham absolvendi ante restitutionem reapse factam, si tempore quo ei confitetur Bertha restituere potest, utcumque ea parata sit ad restitutionem quam primum post confessionem perficiendam. Ratio hujus fundata est tum in fere unanimi sententia Doctorum tum in constitutionibus SS. Pontificum. (*a*) Quod *Doctores* attinet, complures tenent, casum hunc esse Papae ratione sui et sine censura reservatum. Ita docent S. *Alphonsus* Theol. mor. vi. 580 et praesertim Hom. ap. tr. 13, n. 8, et 9, cum *Giordanini:* Istruzione per i nov. conf. Venezia 1757, II. n. 438, 439; *Gury*, II. n. 570; *Scavini* ed. 12, n. 363; *Sabetti* n. 781, qu. 3; *Del Vecchio* II. n. 712; *Ninzatti* n. 1689;

Kenrick tr. 18, n. 155; *Müller* III. § 144; *Gabriel a Varceno* ed. 10, II. p. 176; *Noldin:* de Sacram. Oeniponte 1893 n. 159; *Matharan:* Asserta mor. n. 461; *Benger* Pastoralth. p. 426; *Schieler:* Buss-Sakr. Paderborn, 1894, p. 295; *Marc.* n. 1772; *Aertnys* VI. n. 238; *Konings* n. 1400; *Berardi:* Prax. Conf. ed. 1, n. 501, IV. E; *Zitelli;* App. jur. eccl. ed. 2, p. 357; *Bonal:* Inst. jur. can. tr. VI. n. 131; *Deshayes:* Mem. Jur. can. n. 1111 et 1337, aliique. Casum hunc esse Sedi Apostolicae reservatum, expressis verbis tenet S. Poenitentiaria in pagella facultatum ad n. VI., quas Episcopis communicat[1] nec non in illa, facultates pro confessariis continente.[2]

Alii quidem Theologi reservationem papalem hujus casus negant, attamen consentiunt, poenitentem munera haec restituere potentem esse absolutionis incapacem, quamdiu ea reapse non restituat. Ita tenet *Haine:* Elem. Lovaniae 1883, tom. III, de poen. qu. 36; *Piatus Mont.* ad Van der Velden: Principia II. n. 280; *Bucceroni:* Cas. reserv. n. 11; *Ballerini:* Opus mor. vol. V., tr. 10, n. 724; Anonymus in nota ad Ferraris v. Reservatio n. 13; *Ferraris* ipse v. Regulares n. 68; *Bouix* de Jur. Reg. II. p. 528; Il Mon. eccles. vol. VIII. Part. II. pag. 14, etc.; *D'Annibale:* Summula, I. n. 338 (15) dicit, in casu adesse jurisdictionis ademptionem.

Proprie loquendo vero contradictio inter utramque sententiam in aequivocatione consistit et facile conciliari potest. Dum enim priores reservationem jam in eo vident, quod in casu nemo absolvere potest nisi S. Pontifex et cui hic facultatem concedit, posteriores insuper postulant, ut pro reservatione adhuc accedat obligatio recurrendi ad reservantem pro obtinenda absolutione, hanc autem obligationem, dicunt, in casu non existere. In praxi ergo utrique in hoc conveniunt, eum qui munera a Religiosis acceperit, et non restituerit, absolvi non posse supposito quod ea possit hic et nunc restituere, ita ut in praxi differentia dispareat eo vel magis, quod nec ulli ex prioris sententiae Theologis in men-

1 Pagellam hanc habes ap. AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, Vol. xvi., pag. 173; et Putzer: *Comment.*, ed. iv. pag. 432.

2 Putzer, ib., p. 226.

tem veniat, rebus ita se habentibus pro facultate absolvendi ad S. Sedem recurrere.

(*b*) Doctrina haec fundatur in const. Clementis VIII. *Religiosae Congregationes* de 13 Kal. Jul. 1594.[1] Hic enim postquam violationes voti paupertatis enumeraverat, declaravit (§ 9), quod, qui aliquid ex violationibus illis acceperint id suum non faciant, verum ipso facto absque monitione judicis ad illius restitutionem in utroque foro teneantur, adeo *ut restitutione ipsa realiter non facta, neque etiam in foro conscientiae absolvi possint*—addens (§ 10): "Restitutionem fieri volumus non Religioso, qui donavit, sed monasterio . . . . ita ut nec qui donavit nec monasterium eam remittere vel condonare possit." Ex quo evidenter liquet, eum qui possit restituere—qui possit, dico, nam impotentem non urget Ecclesia—restitutione non facta esse inhabilem absolutionis. Idem eruitur ex const. Urbani VIII. *Nuper* de 16 Oct. 1640,[2] in qua const. Clementis VIII. in quibusdam moderatur et ad jus commune reducitur,[3] attamen etiam facultas conceditur *quoad praeterita* in aliquibus absolvendi in foro conscientiae, *etiam non facta prius hujusmodi rerum donatarum vel datarum restitutione* (ergo in const. Clementis jurisdictio in hoc fuit restricta) et demum (§ 2), Sanctitas Sua (Urbanus VIII.) constitutionem Clementis VIII. in reliquis partibus jussit observari eamque contra praetensas consuetudines[4] innovavit.

Ex dictis jam facile perspicitur, in constitutionibus praedictis non solummodo reservari condonationem et compositionem debiti, ut putare videtur Editor Ratisbonensis Compendii Guriani vol. ii. n. 953, sed revera absolvendi facul-

1 Eam habes ap. *Ferraris* v. Regulares, art. I. n. 67—item sed cum num. marg. diversis in *Bullar. Taurin.* vol. x. 146; et ap *Monacelli* (ed. 1844), tom I. 402.

2 Apud *Ferraris* v. Regulares n. 67. *Monacelli* l. c. et *Bullar. Taurin.* XV. p 81.

3 Per utramque const. simul sumptam nihil novi quoad objectum voti paupertatis fuit introductum. *Rotarius:* Theol. mor. Regularium tom 2, lib. III. cap. 3, punct. i. n. 4.

4 Talem consuetudinem irrepsisse in Hispania, testantur Salmant. tom. 3, tr. 13, de rest. c. 6, n. 10. Cfr. S. Alph.: Hom. ap. tr. 13, n. 9.

tatem esse ademptam, nec casum Papae esse reservatum tantum, quamdiu dona retinens ea restituere nolit, reservationem autem cessare, *si restituere consentiat*, uti docet Dumas II. n. 570 ad IV. cum aliis; nam, ut patet ex dictis, qui restituere potest, absolvi nequit, licet consentiat et omnino paratus sit ad restituendum. Restituat prius oportet et restitutione realiter facta, absolvi potest a quocumque confessario.

Ad exposita adhuc observo:

(1) Munera restitutioni obnoxia ea tantum sunt, quae *certe* cum peccato contra votum paupertatis sunt donata, minime vero illa, quae ex actu virtutis prodierunt. Ea porro, quae infra decem dollaria sunt nec ex bonis propriis Religionis illicite donata sunt, vi facultatis a S. Poenitentiaria obtentae commutari possunt in eleemosynam a confessario taxandam et in bonum Religionis tradendam, cui alias facienda esset restitutio.[1]

(2) Reservationi constitutionis Clementis VIII. non nisi Religiosi utriusque sexus subjiciuntur, qui habent vota solemnia necnon illi, qui in Societate Jesu vota simplicia emiserunt, verbo ii tantum, qui sunt Religiosi in sensu stricto sive viri sive mulieres. Unde ad quaes., utrum reservatio a Summis Pontificibus facta peccati recipientium munera a Regularibus, comprehendat illos etiam, qui munera accipiunt a Religiosis alterutrius sexus pertinentibus ad Instituta in quibus vota tantum simplicia nuncupantur? S. Poenit. 15 Mart. 1861 resp. Negative.

(3) Item excipiendi sunt a reservatione praedicta illi Religiosi vota solemnia habentes, qui a conventu et obedientia Superiorum omnino separati sunt, ut ii, qui sunt saecularizati, Episcopi Regulares aut qui habent beneficium ecclesiasticum, de cujus fructibus ex licentia Papae habent plenam administrationem aut qui sive juste sive injuste ejecti sunt e monasterio, et demum Religiosi militares, qui in Bulla Clsmentis VIII. (§1) expresse excipiuntur.[2]

1 Cfr. Putzer: Comment. p. 226.

2 Ita Rotarius tom. 2, lib. III. cap. 3, punct. i. n. 10–12; et *Il Monitore eccl.* l. c. pag. 15.

Ex dictis jam Pancratius perspectum habebit, quid quoad absolutionem Berthae dandam sibi sit faciendum. Certe sufficit ad eam absolvendum, si Bertha ei tradat infra confessionem summam pecuniae quam illicite accepit, ut ipse eam transmittat ad conventum, cui restitutio est facienda.

J. P., C.SS.R.

OUR YOUNG MEN PROBLEM.

HOW are we to save our young men? Save them to the faith and from evil habits? This is a question which engrosses the attention and taxes the energies of many a zealous pastor.

Attempts in this direction, made principally through societies, halls and club rooms, have met with only mediocre success. The masses of the young men have not been reached by these means. Societies are useful for those who take a persevering interest in them; but the young men that most need the help of the social organisms which will bind them to religion are not the ones who undertake as a rule to promote their existence.

If halls and club rooms have their advantages, they are not without their dangers. They afford many a pretense for late hours, and multiply those numerous occasions of going wrong and forming evil associations which meet the youth at every turn in city or town. There is another danger which attaches especially to the club rooms; it weans off the affections from the home and prevents the reciprocal influence of its members.

Leo XIII. gives the key to the solution of "Our Young Men Problem." His Holiness shows that the evils of society

are to be prevented or remedied through the family—a natural and a divinely appointed means. "All men know that prosperity, public and private, depends *chiefly upon the constitution of the family.* The more deeply virtue is rooted in the heart of the *family*, and the greater has been the solicitude of parents in teaching their children by word and example the precepts of religion, so much the more abundant must be the fruit springing up for the benefit of the race. It is thus of *sovereign importance* not only that domestic society should be sanctified in *its constitution*, but also that it should be ruled by holy laws, and that the spirit of religion and the principles of Christian life should be developed within it consistently and constantly." (Apostolic Letter, June 14, 1892.)

When a pastor is about to undertake a project in his parish, he seeks out those best fitted to assist him. In the great aim of saving or reforming our young men, why not prepare and utilize those who are responsible by the very law of nature, and aided by "a great Sacrament," for the accomplishment of this end?

The domestic life, and the right discipline of home, are the fundamental conditions of human happiness and of Christian progress.

The influence of religion on the minds of young persons is measured largely by the kind of material that the Church receives from the parents of her children. The Church, as teacher, has practically no direct influence on children until they are eight or ten years of age. Before that time the Christian training of children is absolutely in the hands of parents. Generally speaking, as the parents are, so shall the children be.

In the home we find, already prepared, three great levers which may be utilized: 1, the principle of parental authority; 2, the principle of obedience in children; 3, the principle of mutual love between the members of the family. If any one of these principles is allowed to weaken, if a single one of these essential arches in the fabric of the Christian home gives way, the whole structure is apt to fall; and

it is difficult even for the Church, with all her powerful influences, to repair the ruins.

To maintain and apply these principles, it is necessary to provide Christian schooling *for the parents themselves.* Whilst the parochial school has its advantages, it must be remembered that the pliable hearts of children are usually moulded for good or for evil between the time of infancy and their school years. Again, the training given to children in Catholic schools is frequently rendered fruitless on account of the want of Christian practice in the home. The same influences which act upon the children at home during school years, remain with them from *the time when they leave school*, as a rule, until they are of a marriageable age. In short, it is evident that in the great work of Christian training, the parents are inevitably the most important and influential *teachers* of their children, not only before they arrive at school years and after they have left school, but even during the time that they are under the control of religious preceptors in the parish school.

If no school can well succeed without *trained* teachers, it follows that the teachers of the home school must be taught before they are fit to teach others.

If normal schools have their admitted advantage in training teachers, we cannot ignore the importance of a method by which parents are taught how to govern and train their children in a Christian manner.

It is a principle in pedagogy that the primary grades should have the most patient and skillful teachers. But in the Christian schooling, the primary grades are necessarily and exclusively intrusted to parents.

Now, this is precisely the object our Holy Father had in view in establishing the Confraternity of the Holy Family. It was to be a means by which the needs of society might be reached directly through the family, that is to say, by sanctifying the home. By means of such an association, both parents and children would be schooled in all Christian virtues ; they would be more easily impressed with a deep sense of their respective obligations, and learn to appreciate the

advantages of home life. The action of grace, the power of example, and the fair ideal within practical reach of the Catholic who sees in the Holy Family the model of a Christian home, would save many a wayward youth. Even though some young men of the present generation should not be adequately benefitted by the helps of this association, yet these means would save future families, as well as the younger members of present families; for, the blessings of the Confraternity itself, the virtues which it prompts in efforts made to acquire meekness and self-restraint, the prayers of the members, and the opportunity which the existence of the Confraternity would afford for instructions by the priest on the special duties of the family, would act and react on all the members of the household.

Many parents have but rare occasion to hear a sermon on the particular obligations of their state of life, either because the priest speaks but seldom on the subject, or the parents are not well represented at the Mass at which such instructions are given. This may account for the fact that many Catholic parents of good will are found to be remiss in the discharge of their duties towards their family: "Therefore is my people led away captive, because they had not knowledge." (Isai. v., 13.)

Our people lose sight of the sacramental character of marriage itself: and this accounts, in a great measure at least, for the disorganized state of many Catholic homes.

Monthly or quarterly meetings of the Confraternity might be held for enrolling members, and for giving short instructions. These instructions, besides benefitting the parents, would gradually prepare the younger members of the family for their future obligations.

Nor would the influence of such instructions be confined to the family, since its members would soon become missionaries in their own way. The Catholic schools would be more appreciated, better attended and more willingly supported, and the whole parish would soon manifest more lively faith and genuine piety.

The meetings of the Confraternity might be held on Sunday afternoon, or on some evening during the week. If the pastor or his assistant should not have time to give these instructions, an annual retreat, given specially for the Confraternity, might accomplish this end in some measure. A neighboring priest, or a member of a religious community, might be invited for a few days to give conferences on subjects relating specially to the family. Taking only one point at a time, and occupying only about twenty minutes, the matter would not be burdensome to the priest, and the subject could be made interesting to the hearers.

The end to be attained will readily suggest the proper subjects, such as parental vigilance, kindly correction, good example, bad example (fifth commandment), household prayer, meekness (the absence of it makes home unbearable: "It is better to dwell in a wilderness than with a quarrelsome and passionate woman." Prov. xxi., 19. Meekness cheers the home and attracts all hearts like a magnet: "A mild answer breaketh wrath." Prov. xv., 1. "Blessed are the meek," etc.),—forbearance, mutual love, home training, Catholic schools, avoiding dangerous company, evenings to be spent at home, company-keeping, marriage, how to bring the blessing of God on it, its sacramental grace to be remembered in the hour of trial, mixed marriages, best avoided by imbibing the spirit of the Church in time before the affections become entangled with non-Catholics, loyalty to the Church, support of the Church, support of the schools, zeal, love of home, cheerfulness, intemperance, sobriety, total abstinence, good literature, etc., etc. These are topics which though not essential to the Confraternity of the Holy Family suggest great opportunities afforded by the Confraternity. Parties needing such instructions would be more easily reached in this way than in any other way, and more abiding results would be reached by their presentation than by the formal sermon at the High Mass.

The only essential conditions required for an effective working of the Confraternity of the Holy Family are: 1,

to have the names inscribed in the register by the pastor or assistant; 2, to have a picture of the Holy Family in the home; 3, to say daily together some prayer before that picture. To these conditions are attached the choicest benedictions of heavens for the family and for society as is pointed out by the Holy Father, who enriches moreover the Confraternity with great and numerous indulgences.

"This Association," he says, "has for its object the work of accomplishing a closer and stricter union, by bonds of piety, between Christian families and the Holy Family of Nazareth—or, rather, the work of devoting and dedicating Christian families totally and completely to the Holy Family, so that Jesus, Mary and Joseph may take under their care the homes thus consecrated, *and may protect them as being their very own.*

This Confraternity, then, is regarded by Leo XIII. as the finger of God pointing out the proper means to a great end; and we who are responsible for souls are not free from fault in ignoring it, all the more, since the Pontiff in his Apostolic Letter on this subject, adds: "We have a certain hope that all those to whom is committed the care of the salvation of souls, and principally the Bishops, will share our intentions and our wishes in the establishment of this pious Association, and will aid us in prospering the same. . . ."

Here, therefore, we have a key to the solution of "Our Young Men Problem."

To aim at saving our youth merely by societies and club rooms, is like trimming the branches of a tree to make it fruitful. To draw them together unto practical Christian home life through the family is like digging deeply around the roots of the tree and putting in a fertilizer.

A VINCENTIAN MISSIONARY.

ANALECTA.

E S. R. UNIV. INQUISITIONE.

I.

DE ORDINE SERVANDO IN BAPTISMO CONFERENDO, IN BAPTIZANDIS QUI ATTIGERINT AETATEM 14 ANNORUM.

Eme ac Rme Dne,

A Sacra Rituum Congregatione remissum est Supremae huic Congregationi dubium expositum ab Em. Tua, utrum scilicet baptizari possint, servato ordine Baptismi parvulorum, ii pueri neophyti qui scholis catholicis admissi baptizantur ante primam Communionem.

Porro Emi Patres una mecum Inquisitores Generales, mature perpenso proposito dubio, respondendum esse duxerunt *Affirmative;* responsiones autem praescriptae dentur à pueris baptizandis insimul cum eorum patrinis. Haec autem Emorum Patrum responsio a SS. D. N. rata ac confirmata est.

Attamen mens est eiusdem S. O. ut Em. Tua qua pollet apostolica charitate, parochorum zelum excitet, qui curent ut ii pueri catholicorum scholis recepti opportuno tempore ad baptismum accedant.

Haec autem dum pro mei muneris ratione E. Tuae communico, quo par est obsequio eiusdem manus humillime deosculor.

Emae Tuae *Humill. Dnus. servus verus,*
P. *Card.* CATERINI.

Emo *Cardinali* GUIBERT, *Archiepo Parisien.*

Romae, 10 Maii 1879.

II.

DE ORDINATIONE SUPPLENDA IN CASU QUO IMPOSITIO MANUUM OMISSA FUIT A SACERDOTIBUS ADSISTENTIBUS, ET PROBABILITER AB IPSO EPO ORDINANTE.

Beatissime Pater,

Episcopus N. N. ad pedes S. V. provolutus, humiliter exponit quod in ordinatione sacerdotis B. ex mera oblivione, omissa fuit impositio manuum ex parte Sacerdotum adsistentium ; insuper non recordatur Episcopus (neque alii adstantes recordantur) utrum tenuerit manus elevatas super caput ordinandi, durante secunda impositione quando recitabatur oratio *Oremus fratres carissimi*, etc., quapropter a supremo oraculo petit quid nunc agere debeat.

Feria iv. *die 17 Martii 1897.*

In Congregatione Gen. S. R. et U. Inquisitionis habita ab EE. et RR. DD. Cardinalibus Generalibus Inquisitoribus, proposito suprascripto Dubio, iidem EE. ac RR. DDni responderi mandarunt : *Sacerdos B. ordinetur secreto et sub conditione quacumque die, etiam feriata, obtenta a SSmo facultate.*

Sequenti vero fer. V. die 18 eiusdem mensis et anni, in solita Audientia R. P. D. Adsessori impertita, facta de his omnibus relatione SS. D. N. Leoni PP. XIII., idem SS. Dominus resolutionem Emorum et Rmorum Patrum in omnibus adprobavit, facultatem concedendo.

I. *Can.* MANCINI, *S. R. et U. Inq. Notarius.*

III.

VI FACULTATUM CUMULANDI, DISPENSARE POTEST EPUS CIRCA IMPEDIMENTUM DIRIMENS SECRETUM, CONCURRENTE ETIAM ALIO IMP. DIR. PUBLICO ; SI VERO UNUM SIT DIRIMENS, ALIUD VERO IMPEDIENS (CUIUS DISPENSATIO RESERVATUR S. SEDI) INDIGET SPECIALI FACULTATE.

Beatissime Pater,

Episcopus Mysurien. ad pedes S. V. provolutus, humiliter exponit se interdum ancipitem haerere in usu facultatum

ANALECTA.

E S. R. UNIV. INQUISITIONE.

I.

DE ORDINE SERVANDO IN BAPTISMO CONFERENDO, IN BAPTIZANDIS QUI ATTIGERINT AETATEM 14 ANNORUM.

Eme ac Rme Dne,

A Sacra Rituum Congregatione remissum est Supremae huic Congregationi dubium expositum ab Em. Tua, utrum scilicet baptizari possint, servato ordine Baptismi parvulorum, ii pueri neophyti qui scholis catholicis admissi baptizantur ante primam Communionem.

Porro Emi Patres una mecum Inquisitores Generales, mature perpenso proposito dubio, respondendum esse duxerunt *Affirmative;* responsiones autem praescriptae dentur a pueris baptizandis insimul cum eorum patrinis. Haec autem Emorum Patrum responsio a SS. D. N. rata ac confirmata est.

Attamen mens est eiusdem S. O. ut Em. Tua qua pollet apostolica charitate, parochorum zelum excitet, qui curent ut ii pueri catholicorum scholis recepti opportuno tempore ad baptismum accedant.

Haec autem dum pro mei muneris ratione E. Tuae communico, quo par est obsequio eiusdem manus humillime deosculor.

Emae Tuae *Humill. Dnus. servus verus,*
P. *Card.* CATERINI.

Emo *Cardinali* GUIBERT, *Archiepo Parisien.*

Romae, 10 Maii 1879.

II.

DE ORDINATIONE SUPPLENDA IN CASU QUO IMPOSITIO MANUUM OMISSA FUIT A SACERDOTIBUS ADSISTENTIBUS, ET PROBABILITER AB IPSO EPO ORDINANTE.

Beatissime Pater,

Episcopus N. N. ad pedes S. V. provolutus, humiliter exponit quod in ordinatione sacerdotis B. ex mera oblivione, omissa fuit impositio manuum ex parte Sacerdotum adsistentium ; insuper non recordatur Episcopus (neque alii adstantes recordantur) utrum tenuerit manus elevatas super caput ordinandi, durante secunda impositione quando recitabatur oratio *Oremus fratres carissimi*, etc., quapropter a supremo oraculo petit quid nunc agere debeat.

Feria iv. *die 17 Martii 1897.*

In Congregatione Gen. S. R. et U. Inquisitionis habita ab EE. et RR. DD. Cardinalibus Generalibus Inquisitoribus, proposito suprascripto Dubio, iidem EE. ac RR. DDni responderi mandarunt : *Sacerdos B. ordinetur secreto et sub conditione quacumque die, etiam feriata, obtenta a SSmo facultate.*

Sequenti vero fer. V. die 18 eiusdem mensis et anni, in solita Audientia R. P. D. Adsessori impertita, facta de his omnibus relatione SS. D. N. Leoni PP. XIII., idem SS. Dominus resolutionem Emorum et Rmorum Patrum in omnibus adprobavit, facultatem concedendo.

I. *Can.* MANCINI, *S. R. et U. Inq. Notarius.*

III.

VI FACULTATUM CUMULANDI, DISPENSARE POTEST EPUS CIRCA IMPEDIMENTUM DIRIMENS SECRETUM, CONCURRENTE ETIAM ALIO IMP. DIR. PUBLICO ; SI VERO UNUM SIT DIRIMENS, ALIUD VERO IMPEDIENS (CUIUS DISPENSATIO RESERVATUR S. SEDI) INDIGET SPECIALI FACULTATE.

Beatissime Pater,

Episcopus Mysurien. ad pedes S. V. provolutus, humiliter exponit se interdum ancipitem haerere in usu facultatum

cumulandi (ut aiunt) quibus in tribuendis dispensationibus matrimonialibus pollet. Hinc enixe petit insequentium dubiorum resolutionem:

I. Utrum concurrente aliquo impedimento dirimente secreto, seu fori interni, cum alio impedimento item dirimente, sed publico, necessaria sit ad dispensationem specialis cumulandi facultas.

II. Utrum concurrentibus duobus impedimentis, quorum unum sit dirimens et alterum impediens tantum, eo excepto quod *mixtae religionis* dicunt, pariter necesse sit ad dispensationem specialis cumulandi facultas.

Fer. iv., *18 Augusti 1897.*

In Congregatione Generali S. R. et U. Inquisitionis habita ab Emis ac Rmis DD. Cardinalibus Generalibus Inquisitoribus, propositis suprascriptis dubiis, praehabitoque RR. DD. Consultorum voto iidem EEmi ae RRmi DDni responderi mandarunt:

Ad I. Negative; et detur Decretum diei 31 Martii 1872, *in Coimbaturen.*

Ad II. Affirmative quoad impedimenta impedientia, quorum dispensatio reservatur S. Sedi, ea nempe quae oriuntur ex mixta religione ut aiunt, atque ex sponsalibus et ex voto simplici perpetuae castitatis; secus in reliquis, circa quae Episcopus uti poterit iure suo.

Feria vero VI., die 20 eiusdem mensis et anni, in solita Audientia R. P. D. Adsessori S. O. impertita, facta de his omnibus relatione SS. D. N. Leoni PP. XIII., idem SSmus Dominus resolutionem EE. ac RR. Patrum in omnibus adprobavit.

Decretum autem die 31 Martii 1872 datum occasione dubii a R. P. D. Vicario Apostolico Coimbaturen. propositi, prout constat ex actis S. Congr. de Propag. Fide, sic se habet: "SSmus Dominus declaravit generatim prohibitionem concedendi absque speciali facultate dispensationes, quando in una eademque persona concurrunt impedimenta matrimonialia, non extendi ad eos casus, in quibus cum impedimento

natura sua publico aliud occurrit impedimentum occultum, seu fori interni."

I. *Can.* MANCINI, *S. R. et U. Inq. Notarius.*

IV.

DE TRANSITU AD SUCCESSORES FACULTATUM SPECIALIUM HABITUALITER A S. SEDE ORDINARIIS CONCESSARUM, PRO TEMPORE ET IN TERMINIS CONCESSIONIS.

Feria IV., *24 Novembris, 1897.*

In Cong. Gen. S. Rom. Univ. Inquis. habita ab Emis ac Rmis DD. Card. in rebus fidei et morum Gen. Inquisitoribus, iidem Emi Patres, rerum temporumque adiunctis mature perpensis, decernendum censuerunt: Supplicandum SSmo, ut declarare seu statuere dignetur facultates omnes speciales habitualiter a S. Sede Episcopis aliorumque locorum Ordinariis concessas non suspendi vel desinere ob eorum mortem vel a munere cessationem, sed ad successores Ordinarios transire ad formam et in terminis decreti a sup. hac Cong. editi die 20 Februarii, 1888, quoad dispensationes matrimoniales.

Insequenti vero feria VI., die 26 Novembris, 1897, in solita audientia R. P. D. Adsessori S. O. impertita facta de his omnibus SSmo D. N. Leoni Div. Prov. Pp. XIII. relatione, Sanctitas Sua Emorum Patrum resolutionem adprobavit, atque ita perpetuis futuris temporibus servandum mandavit, contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

IOS. *Can.* MANCINI, *S. R. et U. I. Notarius.*

L. ✠ S.

E S. CONGREGATIONE EPISCOPORUM ET REGULARIUM.

I.

LAUDATUR SOCIETAS MISSIONARIORUM A S. JOSEPHO (MISIONEROS JOSEFINOS), MEXICAN.

Perillustris ac Rme Domine, uti Frater addictissime,

Diligenti studio examini subjectis novis precibus a Superiore Generali piae Societatis Missionum *Filiorum Mariae*

et Joseph Sacrae Congregationi Episcoporum et Regularium porrectis, et a plerisque Mexicanae regionis Episcopis commendatis, ad hoc, ut praefata pia Societas canonico Laudis Decreto condecoraretur, Sacra Congregatio, perpendens traditas die 28 Maii 1894 animadversiones ex parte tantum executioni demandatas, novumque Constitutionum corpus ad tramites praefinitos in omnibus redactum haud fuisse; operae pretium duxit formale Laudis Decretum ad opportunius tempus differre. Verumtamen prae oculis habens opera fructuosa, quae ex vita ac zelo praefatae piae Societatis sodalium, christianae civilique reipublicae obveniunt, ac maiora quae in posterum, Deo opitulante, obventura erunt, aucto sodalium numero, Constitutionibusque ad formam SS. Canonum redactis, ordinateque dispositis; eadem Sacra Congregatio opportunum existimat *promeritas laudes enunciatae piae Societati tribuere, prout praesentibus litteris libenter tribuit.* Praeterea, ut voti compotes quamprimum fiant, et apostolicam approbationem consequantur, sodales ipsos adhortatur atque excitat, ut studio incoeptae fundationis efficacius incumbant, ea media adhibendo, quibus tum Instituti, tum eiusdem regiminis formae provideant. Neque interea ab operibus ad propriam sanctificationem animarumque salutem susceptis desistant; imo maiori contentione atque animi alacritate, Ordinariorum ductu in vinea Domini excolenda in dies laborare studeant; memores evangelici effati: "Messis quidem multa, operarii autem pauci." Haec ad laudem et incrementum pluries memorati pii Instituti Amplitudini Tuae erant significanda, atque interim fausta omnia Tibi adprecor a Domino.

Amplitudinis Tuae

Addictissimus uti Frater,
I. *Card.* VERGA, *Praef.*

Illmo ac Rmo Domino
Archiepiscopo Mexicano Alarcon.

Romae 27 Septembris 1894.

II.

DECRETUM FORMALE LAUDIS.

Anno 1872 opera et zelo presbyteri Iosephi Mariae Vilaseca in Dioecesi ac civitate Mexicana ortum duxit pia Societas Missionum a S. Iosepho nuncupata. Peculiaris huius Societatis finis seu scopus in eo est, ut primum quidem propriae cuiusque socii sanctificationi, uti par est, prospiciatur, deinde vero animarum saluti procurandae tum per sacras conciones, tum per institutionem scholarum, sive apud fideles, sive apud infideles impense adlaboretur. Sodales autem omnes unius Rectoris Generalis moderationi subsunt, et expleto novitiatu, simplicia vota obedientiae, paupertatis et castitatis in perpetuum emittunt.

Enimvero praefata Societas inde ab initio variis modis, nec mediocriter, tentata fuit, sed nihilominus caelesti suffulta auxilio, uberes ad Dei gloriam ac animarum salutem iam tulit fructus, et fundatissima spes affulget eosdem fructus fore in posterum multo uberiores. Quare ubi primum praelaudatus presbyter Vilaseca S. Sedem pro Apostolica Societatis approbationi supplex adivit, quamplures Mexicanae regionis Episcopi, aliique praestantissimi viri, datis ultro litteris, ipsius preces summopere commendare non dubitarunt.

Porro haec ipsa S. Congregatio Episcoporum et Regularium, tribus fere abhinc annis, peculiari benevolentiae testimonio enuntiatam Societatem dignam habuit. Nuper autem quum idem Societatis Fundator et Moderator Generalis, transmisso Constitutionum exemplari, iterum supplicaverit SSmo Domino Nostro Leoni divina Providentia PP. XIII., ut Constitutiones ipsas una cum Instituto Auctoritate Apostolica comprobaret, Sanctitas Sua, re mature perpensa, attentisque praesertim commendatitiis litteris praefatorum Antistitum, enuntiatos Sodales speciali favore prosequi cupiens, iisque volens animum addere, ut alacrius in propositum finem contendant, in audientia habita ab infrascripto Cardinali S. Congregationis Episcoporum et Regularium Praefecto die 16 huius mensis, recensitam Societatem Mis-

sionariorum a S. Iosepho amplissimis verbis laudare et commendare dignata est, prout praesentis Decreti tenore Societas ipsa amplissime laudatur et commendatur, salva Ordinariorum iurisdictione ad formam Sacrorum Canonum et Apostolicarum Constitutionum, dilata ad opportunius tempus approbatione, tum Societatis, tum Constitutionum, circa quas interim nonnullas animadversiones communicari mandavit.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria memoratae S. Congregationis Episcoporum et Regularium die 20 Augusti 1897.

✠ S. *Card.* VANNUTELLI, *Praef.*

A. TROMBETTA, *Secret.*

L. † S.

III.

ANIMADVERSIONES IN CONSTITUTIONES SOCIETATIS MISSIONARIORUM A S. IOSEPHO NUNCUPATAE.

1°.—*Art.* 2. Post verba *totis viribus attendere* addendum videtur: *per tria vota simplicia paupertatis, castitatis et obedientiae—iuxta praesentes Constitutiones Instituti.*

2°.—*Art. 4.* Procurator Generalis, qui administrationem etiam bonorum temporalium gerit, nequit inter Consiliarios Generalis annumerari; quia, saltem quotannis, ipsimet Consilio suae administrationis rationem reddere debet. Quapropter hoc in articulo, eo expuncto e gremio Consultorum Generalium, horum numerus ad quatuor praefiniatur. Huiusmodi emendatio etiam ad articulos 15, 25 et 28 proportionate apponatur.[1]

3°.—*Art. 16.* Post n. 4$^{m\,2}$ recenseantur saltem potiora maioris et gravioris momenti negotia. Eadem inserenda ad art. 25.

4°.—*Art. 20.* Iuramentum,[3] quod hic praescribitur, ut minus necessarium, supprimendum videtur.

1 In his, ut in praesenti, sermo est de numero Consultorum, ex quorum gremio debet expungi Procurator, tum Generalis, tum Provincialis tum et ipse Localis, propter signatam rationem.

2 Heic de Consultorum officiis agitur: in n. 25 de iisdem sermo redit.

3 Vir enim nec probus, nec prudens ad Secretarii munus eligi non oportebat: iuramentum proinde huiusmodi de silentio circa gesta aut deliberata servando, haud erat ab eodem exigendum.

5.°—*Art. 32.* Magis expediens erit ad bonum Instituti praefinire quod in Capitulis Generalibus, praeter officiales natos, duo saltem intersint delegati ex familiis uniuscuiusque Provinciae.

6°.—*Art. 33.* Praeter Const. *Nuper* s. m. Innocentii XII., perlegenda erunt Constitutio *Sanctissimus Dominus Noster* Urbani VIII. diei 14 Apr. 1643, adversus haereticam pravitatem edita,[1] et Decr. *In Generali* S. C. S. Officii datum sub Benedicto XIV., die 5 Augusti 1745.

7°.—*Art. 36.* Quatenus poena,[2] de qua in hoc articulo ex gravioribus sit, haud infligenda videtur, nisi cum suffragiorum Capitularium maioritate.

8°.—*Art. 39.* Exprimendum erit, an per Capituli Praesidem, vel per scrutinium praestitum cum schedis clausis Capitularium, proponendi sint candidati in electionem Rectoris Generalis.

9°.—*Art. 40.* Si quando etiam die altera votationis, electio Rectoris Generalis non sortiatur, tunc, attenta locorum distantia, res deferenda erit ad Ordinarium loci, ubi Capitulum celebratur, qui, tamquam Sedis Apostolicae Delegatus, pro suo arbitrio et prudentia in Rectorem Generalem eliget unum ex duobus candidatis, qui maioritatem suffragiorum prae aliis retulerunt.

1 Hoc Decretum fuit iuris publici factum, seu ad valvas Basilicarum Lateranensis et Vaticanae, simul et in acie Campi Florae die 5 Ianuarii 1634 affixum. In. ed. Taurinen. Bull. invenitur sub numerum CDLXXIII.

Constitutio Innocentii XII. **Nuper a Congregatione** die 23 Nov. 1697 data, et ab eodem Pontifice die 23 Decembris eiusdem anni confirmata, *de celebratione et Missarum onere* leges fert: Constitutio Urbani VIII. **Sanctissimus Dominus Noster** *districte mandat, ut Superiores cuiusvis Ordinis, Congregationis, Societatis aut Instituti cuiuscumque eorumdem subditos commonefaciant de iniuncta omnibus observantia, et exequutione Apostolicarum Constitutionum, et Decretorum ad S Officium* **adversus haereticam pravitatem** *pertinentium:* Decretum denique Congregationis S. Officii **In generali**, cum correlativis, est **adversus sollicitantes ad turpia** latum.

2 Privationis nempe vocis activae, simul et passivae, casu quo quis elato animo, vel minus prudenter, et post gravem Praesidis monitionem obstinatione non cohibita, se in suffragio ferendo gesserit.

10°.—*Art, 45.* Verba: *In isto vota reddent* ad finem usque huius articuli supprimantur, quia sunt inutilia.[1]

11°.—*Art. 56.* Addenda videntur n. 10[2] quae sequuntur: *Professio perpetua in alio Ordine, vel religioso Instituto emissa.*

12°.—*Art. 59.* Ante mentionem Decr. *Auctis Admodum* notandum venit: *neminem expelli posse, nisi incorrigibilis censeatur et sit,* scilicet qui per remedia a iure praescripta probatus, resipiscendi spem nullam praesefert, idque a S. C. sit confirmatum. Praeterea caput praesens 21 melius post caput 29 transferretur.

13°.—*Art. 77.* Titulus Instituti reformetur prout est concessum.[3]

14°.—*Art. 80.* Observantia Decreti *Quemadmodum* respicit Instituta *virorum omnimode laicorum;* propterea hic, et in articulo sequenti non habet locum.

15°.—*Art. 82.* Ad n. 2[m] ponatur *fungentes* pro *fulgentes;* et *iniunctum* pro *coniunctum.*

16°.—*Caput XXVII.* Caput hoc inscribatur: *De voto et virtute Obedientiae.* Similiter fiat in duobus capitibus de *Castitate* et *Paupertate.*

17°.—*Art. 93.* Ut notio voti et virtutis Obedientiae clarius exprimatur, sequentia verba ad finem huius articuli addantur: *omnes obediant tum in re, tum in voluntate tum in intellectu, ut idem sentiant, velint, et exsequantur, quod Superior indicaverit. Ceterum nihil contra votum obedientiae fieri intelligatur, nisi quod ex Superioris praecepto fuerit iniunctum.*

1 Agitur de Capitulo Provinciali. Verba ut inutilia iure merito censentur, quia revera superfluunt: sunt enim ad litteram repetita.

2 Citatus numerus ceu 10[us] addendus videtur ceteris, qui causas indicant ingressum in Societatem interdicentes.

3 Loco scilicet tituli: **Instituti Missionariorum Filiorum Mariae et Joseph,** ut nuper efferebatur, utendum tantum erit hoc: **Societatis Missionariorum a S. Josepho,** ad Eius mentem, penes quem ius plenum est, omnia, hac in re, corrigendi, emendandi, delendi.

Sodales enim huius Societatis nihil sibi potius habent, quam ut Apostolicae Sedi eamdem, ac ampliorem obedientiam praestent quam Superioribus ipsis art. 93 animadversionum harum tribuit.

18°.—*Art. 103.* In periodo *Huic* dicatur *apponi* pro *opponi.*

19°.—*Art. 109* et *110.* Ii duo articuli melius transferrentur ad finem capitis XXV.[1]

20°.—Pag. 50 capover. *Peractis.* Pro verbo *constituta*, ponatur *constito ;* deinde supprimantur tum verba *sequentem scribat*, etc., tum integra subtusposita *Declaratio*, quia haec in iure non requiruntur. Pro verbis suppressis ponatur : *ad professionem admittatur.*[2]

21°.—Pag. 52ª linea 2ª dicatur : *caelitibus, coram vobis . . .* etc., *praesertim coram Te Patre Rectore Generali* (vel *Provinciali*, aut eorum *Delegato*) *promitto*, etc.

22°.—Quae a pag. 53ª ad finem textus reperiuntur impressa,[3] supprimenda erunt, quia ad textum Constitutionum non pertinent. E contra addenda sunt capita *De bonorum temporalium administratione* et *De singulis officialibus domorum*, vel *residentiarum*, quae desunt. Tandem quaedam etiam alia animadvertenda forent, de quibus ratio habebitur, quum iterum eae Constitutiones examini subiicientur ; quatenus iis provisum non recognoscatur.

A. Trombetta, *Secret.*

IV.

DECRETUM.

APPROBATUR INSTITUTUM SORORUM A DIVINA PASTORA.

Aprili mense anni 1850 in oppido vulgo—Ripoll—Dioeceseos Vicensis, auctore V. Iosepho Toul Ordinis Minorum

1 Hi enim duo articuli tractant de quibusdam mediis ad Instituti finem facilius obtinendum, iure igitur meritoque ad Caput XXV., quod de istiusmodi disserit, erat uterque transferendus.

2 Declaratio haec, seu formula vel chirographum, quo fides de promissis in aliis contractibus fit, hac super re non postulatur a iure : Christifidelibus enim Deo fides data ac iuramento roborata firmior et sanctior est ceteris iuramentis.

3 Sunt autem huiusmodi, preces quaedam in Capitulis, aliisque conventibus adhibendae.

Notae Proc. Gen. eiusd. Congr.

Capulatorum, ortum duxit pium Institutum Sororum quae vulgo a—*Divina Pastora*—nuncupantur. Finis sive scopus, quem peculiariter sibi proposuit praefatum Institutum, in eo est, ut primum quidem propriae cuiusque Sororis sanctificationi prospiciatur, tum vero in instituendis puellis eisque in sanctitate catholicae religionis educandis impense adlaboretur. Cunctae autem Sorores communi utuntur habitu et victu sub regimine Moderatricis Generalis et, expleto novitiatu, simplicia vota paupertatis, obedientiae et castitatis prius ad tempus, dein in perpetuum emittunt. Porro contra huiusmodi Institutum non defuere, vel ab initio, mundi vexationes: quare, paucis post annis necesse quoque fuit a loco originis transmigrare. Verumtamen, superna favente gratia, bonum certamen certavere Sorores, et, constituta subinde in Barcinonensi Civitate Domo principe, non sine magno religionis reique publicae emolumento, in incepto fortiter perstiterunt. Hinc etiam factum est ut Institutum ipsum, die 28 Novembris anni 1888, amplissimae laudis Decreto a Sancta Sede cohonestari meruerit. Nuper autem adaucto iam Sororum numero compluribusque fundatis domibus, Moderatrix Generalis SSmo Domino Nostro Leoni PP. XIII. humillime supplicavit ut tum Institutum, tum eius Constitutiones Apostolica Auctoritate benigne approbare dignaretur. Quam quidem supplicationem Episcopi omnes in quorum Dioecesibus enunciatae Sorores commorantur, videlicet Barcinonensis, Vicensis et Gerundensis, datis ultro litteris, summopere commendare non dubitarunt, adjicientes haud modicam se fovere spem fore ut ex petitae approbationis concessione, uberiores etiam fructus ad Dei gloriam atque animarum salutem consequantur. Itaque Sanctitas Sua, re mature perpensa, attentisque praesertim commendatitiis litteris praefatorum Antistitum, in Audientia habita ab infrascripto Cardinali huius Sacrae Congregationis Episcoporum et Regularium Praefecto die 23 Augusti, 1897, recensitum Institutum uti Congregationem votorum simplicium sub regimine Moderatricis Generalis, salva Ordinariorum iurisdictione, ad formam Sacrorum Canonum et Apostolicarum Constitutionum approbavit et confirmavit,

prout praesentis decreti tenore approbat et confirmat, dilata ad opportunius tempus approbatione Constitutionum, circa quas, interim, nonnullas animadversiones communicari mandavit.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria memoratae Sacrae Congregationis Episcoporum et Regularium, die 6 Septembris, 1897.

S. *Card.* VANNUTELLI, *Praef.*

L. ✠ S. A. TROMBETTA, *Secret.*

V.

IN FAMILIIS RELIGIOSIS, STATUTA QUAE PRAESCRIBUNT CERTOS DIES PRO SS. COMMUNIONE, NON SUNT TAXATIVA, SED DEMONSTRATIVA, AD IUDICIUM SOLIUS CONFESSARII.

Ad Archiepiscopum Burdigalen.

Ex parte officialis istius Curiae ecclesiasticae expositum nuper fuit, quod in omnibus fere familiis Religiosis, praescribuntur in Statutis certi dies, quibus omnes ad sacram Communionem accedere debent; et quod multi Communionum catalogum ita intelligunt, quasi nulli sit licitum saepius communicare, etiam de consilio confessarii, nisi accedat quoque formalis consensus superioris vel superiorissae. Quibus expositis, quaesitum proponit quaenam sit mens Ecclesiae quando approbat haec statuta circa Communionem in familiis Religiosis, an haberi debeant ut *prohibitiva* ne plures fiant communiones; vel praeceptiva, ita ut omnes conentur ita vivere, ut mereantur ad sacram Communionem accedere saltem in illis diebus.

Itaque S. haec Congregatio Episcoporum ac Regularium, omnibus perpensis, respondit:

Negative ad 1. partem, et facultatem frequentius ad S. Synaxim accedendi relinquendam esse privative iudicio confessarii, excluso consensu superioris, vel superiorissae.—

Affirmative ad 2. partem, quoties rationabilis causa non obstet.

4 Augusti 1888.

E SACRA POENITENTIARIA.

I.

SUSTINETUR DISPENSATIO, LICET IN SUPPLICI LIBELLO ERROR ADFUERIT IN EXPRIMENDO STIPITE, EX QUO PROVENIÉBAT UNUM EX IMPEDIM. CONSANGUINITATIS.

Beatissime Pater,

Sub die 30 martii 1897, Joannes B... et Rosalia J..., N... dioecesis, a Dataria Apostolica rescriptum dispensationis reportaverunt *supra secundo in linea aequali ex uno, ac duplici quarto ex tertio* stipitibus provenien. consanguinitatis gradibus.

Ita ferebat rescriptum, dum revera dispensatio postulata fuerat super *secundo ex uno, quarto ex altero ac demum item quarto ex tertio* stipitibus provenien. consanguinitatis gradibus.

Iamvero cum tempus urgeret et error rescripti circa quid accidentale versaretur, Ordinarius N... rescriptum executus est, sponsique in facie Ecclesiae rite copulati sunt. Hinc quaerit:

1° Utrum rescriptum valide et licite executus fuerit?

Die 1 februarii 1895, cum quidam Ordinarius in libello supplici se originis Ordinarium affirmaverit, dum revera Ordinarius domicilii esset, S. Poenitentiaria sciscitanti respondit dispensationem valide et licite fuisse datam, verum errorem corrigendum esse. Hinc:

2° Utrum ipse Ordinarius N... debeat et in casu actuali errorem rescripti corrigere?

Et Deus...

Sacra Poenitentiaria Ordinario N... super praemissis respondet: *Facta correctione, acquiescat.*

Datum Romae ex Sacra Poenitentiaria die 2 iunii 1897.

B. POMPILI, *S. P. Corrector*,
V. CANCUS LUCCHETTI, *S. P. Secrius.*

II.

DISPENSATIO CONCESSA A S. POENIT. INTUITU UNIUS GRAVIS ET SUFFICIENTIS CAUSAE, SUSTINETUR, ETIAM SI QUOAD ALIAM DIVERSAM CAUSAM INCULPABILIS MISCEATUR ERROR.

Beatissime Pater,

Ad Sacram Poenitentiariam nuper scripsi quod Carolus D.... 27 annos natus, et Iulia Ludovica M..., 23 annos et sex menses nata, dioecesis N..., pedibus S. V. provoluti, legitimum matrimonium contrahere cupientes, humiliter dispensationem implorabant super impedimento consanguinitatis in secundo lineae collateralis gradu. Causas afferebam : *aetatem oratricis fere provectam* (*scilicet 23 annos et 6 menses*), *et conditionem eiusdem parente utroque orbatae.*

Iamvero Sacra Poenitentiaria, sub die 19 aprilis currentis, Ordinario N... facultatem dispensandi concessit ob sequentes rationes : *aetatem oratricis annorum 24*, *conditionem eiusdem orphanae.*

Hinc humilliter quaero an possim nihilominus cum oratoribus dispensare, quum oratrix vigesimum quartum annum non expleverit.

Et Deus...

Sacra Poenitentiaria, ad litteras Ordinarii N... datas die 23 aprilis huius anni, super dubio utrum rescriptum dispensationis matrimonialis oratorum Caroli D... et Iuliae Ludovicae M..., possit idem Ordinarius exequi, cum inter causas legatur aetas oratricis annorum viginti quatuor, quamvis oratrix, ut expositum fuerat, annum vigesimum quartum nondum expleverit ; respondet :

Cum alia adsit causa dispensandi, nihil obstare quominus praefatum dispensationis rescriptum executioni mandetur.

Datum Romae ex Sacra Poenitentiaria die 28 aprilis 1897.

A. CARCANI, *S. P. Reg.*
I. PALICA, *S. P. Substus.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

I.

DE INDULGENTIA ALTARI PRIVILEGIATO ADNEXA.

Episcopus Squillacensis huic S. Congregationi Indulgentiarum sequentia dubia enodanda proposuit:

I.—*An Indulgentia Altaris Privilegiati separari possit ab applicatione seu fructu Sacrificii, quando Sacrificium est celebrandum pro defunctis?*

II.—*An eadem Indulgentia Altaris Privilegiati separari possit, quando celebratur Sacrificium pro vivis, ita ut Indulgentia praedicta applicari possit pro defunctis ad libitum Celebrantis?*

III.—*Quomodo intelligenda sit inscriptio, quae reperitur in aliquibus Altaribus, huius tenoris: "Altare Privilegiatum pro vivis atque defunctis"?*

Et in generali Congregatione habita in Palatio Apostolico Vaticano, die 5 Augusti 1897, Emi Patres rescripserunt:

Ad I^um^ et II^um^: *Negative.*

Ad III^um^: *Interpretanda est ita, ut tam pro vivis, si in Altari, de quo agitur, Missae Sacrificium pro vivis applicetur, quam pro defunctis, si pro his S. Sacrificium applicetur, intelligatur concessa Plenaria Indulgentia; pro vivis ad modum iurisdictionis, pro defunctis ad modum suffragii.*

Et facta per me infrascriptum Card. Praefectum SSmo D. N. Leoni Pp. XIII. de his relatione, in Audientia habita die 25 Augusti 1897, Patrum Cardinalium responsiones Sanctitas Sua ratas habuit et confirmavit.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis die 25 Augusti, 1897.

L. ✠ S. FR. H. M. *Card.* Gotti, *Praef.*
† A. *Archiep.* ANTINOEN, *Secret.*

II.

DECRETUM URBIS ET ORBIS.

DE ERECTIONE ET AGGREGATIONE PIARUM UNIONUM SEU SOCIETATUM, ETC.

Cum hisce temporibus poene innumerae exortae sint in Ecclesia piae Uniones seu Societates, quae etsi quandoque Confraternitatum nomine decorentur, nihilominus inter veras et proprie dictas Confraternitates minime sint recensendae ; merito dubitatum est, an leges, quae a Constitutione Clementis VIII., quae incipit : *Quaecumque*, pro Confraternitatibus et Congregationibus iussae sunt, novis istis piis Unionibus seu Societatibus forent applicandae. Quaestio insuper mota est pro nonnullis Confraternitatibus ad Regulares Ordines pertinentibus, quoad consensum Ordinariorum, cum illae in Ecclesiis eorumdem Regularium Ordinum eriguntur. Quare huic Sacrae Congregationi Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae sequentia dubia dirimenda sunt exhibita :

I.—*An Piae Uniones seu Societates, quae sub Confraternitatum et Congregationum nomine minime veniunt, comprehendantur sub sanctionibus Constitutionis Clementis VIII., quae incipit* "Quaecumque ?"

II.—*An ad erectionem Confraternitatum, puta Sanctissimae Trinitatis, Sanctissimi Rosarii, B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo, vel a Virgine Perdolente, aliarumve huiusmodi, quae a Religiosis Ordinibus in suis respectivis Ecclesiis eriguntur, necessarius sit Ordinarii consensus ?*

Et Emi Patres in Vaticanis Aedibus in generali Congregatione coadunati sub die 5 Augusti 1897 ad proposita dubia responderunt :

Ad I^um^. Affirmative, *quod erectionem seu institutionem, quoad approbationem statutorum, quoad aggregationem et quoad publicationem Indulgentiarum.*

Ad II^um^. *Si agatur de Confraternitatibus proprie dictis, id est ad modum organici corporis et cum* sacco *constitutis,* Affirmative ; *si de Confraternitatibus late acceptis, satis pro-*

visum per consensum praestitum ab Ordinario pro erectione Conventus Ordinis in Dioecesi.

De quibus omnibus facta SSmo Dno Nostro Leoni Pp. XIII. relatione, in Audientia habita ab infrascripto Cardinali Praefecto die 25 Augusti 1897, Sanctitas Sua resolutiones Emorum Patrum approbavit.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem S. C. die 25 Augusti 1897.

FR. HIERONYMUS MARIA *Card.* GOTTI, *Praef.*,
L. ✠ S. † A. *Archiepisc.* ANTINOEN., *Secret.*

E S. RITUUM CONGREGATIONE.

I.

NON INNOVETUR CIRCA DECRETA RESPICIENTIA CULTUM EXHIBENDUM RELIQUIIS PASSIONIS D. N. I. C.

Rmus P. Commissarius Generalis Fratrum Minorum Observantium de Provincia Calabriae Sacrae Rituum Congr. ea quae sequuntur humillime exposuit, nimirum: In Conventu Fratrum Minorum Franciscalium de Observantia prope Petiliam Policastrum ac de Provincia Calabriae, abhinc tribus saeculis una colitur Spina Coronae D. N. I. C. sanguine conspersa et quondam a Rmo Archiepiscopo S. Severinae, in cuius dioecesi situm est oppidum, iuridice recognita et approbata. Haec autem S. Reliquia cum exponitur fidelium venerationi, super tabernaculum collocari solet in quo SSmum Sacramentum asservatur, et ante ipsam transeuntes utrumque flectunt genu; et ipsi Sacerdotes ante eam expositam celebrantes omnia peragunt, quae ante SSmum Sacramentum expositum fieri solent. Idem vero Rmus P. Commissarius Generalis sua cononica visitatione haec omnia nonnisi SSmae Eucharistiae ratus convenire ex ecclesiastica institutione, iussit ab his abstineri et omnia peragi ad tramitem Decretorum Sacrae Rituum Congregationis. Quod aegre ferentibus quibusdam, ut efficacius, in

casu, omnis abusus eliminetur, et debitus honor sacrae Spinae D. N. I. C. tribuatur, praedictus Orator ab eadem Sacra Congregatione enixe postulavit :

I. Utrum praefati usus approbari, vel saltem tolerari possint ?

II. Et quatenus negative, quis sit legitimus cultus eidem S. Spinae tribuendus ?

Et Sacra ipsa Congregatio, referente subscripto Secretario, attentis expositis, utique postulato rescribendum censuit : Stetur decretis, praesertim decreto in *Tridentina* d. d. 12 Mart. 1836, aliisque respicientibus cultum exhibendum ac praescriptum pro Reliquiis vivificae Crucis aliorumque instrumentorum Passionis Dominicae.

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 17 Sept., 1897.

L. M. *Card.* PAROCCHI.
D. PANICI, *Secret.*

II.

DUBIA DE RECITATIONE S. OFFICII IN ANGLIA.

Rmus Dnus Cuthbertus Hedley, Ordinis Sancti Benedicti, Episcopus Neoporten. Sacrae Congregationi ea quae sequuntur humillime exposuit, nimirum :

I. In Anglia nec dari Paroecias strictim dictas nec Beneficia, quibus adnexum sit onus Divini Officii recitandi ; verum Ecclesiis singulis addictos esse unum vel plures Sacerdotes, qui, ibidem residentes, munia quasi parochialia in Territorio sive (ut aiunt) in Districtu Missionario ipsius Ecclesiae ratione muneris exercent.

II. Rectores Ecclesiarum alios esse ad nutum Episcopi amovibiles, alios vero nonnisi praevio Processu Canonico vel Resignatione sponte oblata et acceptata : universos autem

Vicarios, sive Sacerdotes Assistentes esse ad nutum Ordinarii amovibiles.

III. Ecclesias per Angliam perpaucas esse consecratas, ceteras benedictas sub invocatione Sancti Titularis: nonnunquam vero fideles (deficiente Aede Sacra) congregari ad Missam audiendam Sacramentaque suscipienda in Schola vel alia Aula congrua pro publico Oratorio ab Ordinario designata. Quare idem Rmus Episcopus Orator, apprime cupiens cuncta quae cultum divinum respiciunt in sua Dioecesi ad tramites Decretorum Sacrae Rituum Congregationis disponere, enixe postulavit: nempe

I. An apud Anglos in Ecclesiis Cleri Saecularis Kalendarium Dioecesanum a laudata S. Rituum Congregatione approbatum et singulis annis jussu Ordinarii editum, additis festis SS. Titularium, Dedicationis, atque aliis (si qua fuerint) a Sancta Sede concessis, censeatur Kalendarium uniuscujusque Ecclesiae cui proinde quivis Celebrans in Sacro faciendo atque Sacerdotes Ecclesiae etiam in Officio Divino recitando, se conformare debeant?

II. An liceat Regularibus, si quando ipsis precario committeretur una cum cura animarum administratio alicujus Ecclesiae Saecularium Sacros functiones juxta ordinem Kalendarii propriae Religiosae Congregationis peragere, relicto Kalendario Dioecesano cui populus jam assuetus fuerit?

III. An Regularis Ecclesiae Saeculari aliquando ad tempus sive ad beneplacitum Episcopi (Superiore Religioso assentiente) praepositus atque privatim recitans Horas Canonicas, adhibito juxta decreta a S. Rituum Congreg. Kalendario proprii Ordinis, tenetur nihilominus ad Officium Sancti Titularis Ecclesiae Saecularis praedictae et quidem sub ritu duplicis primae classis cum Octava?

IV. Item, an, commissa absque tempore praefinito, administratione Ecclesiae Regularis Sacerdoti saeculari, huic liceat, amoto Kalendario Regularium, quo hactenus usus fuerit Clerus illius Ecclesiae ordinare Missas et Officia publica juxta Kalendarium Dioecesanum?

V. Quid decernendum de Kalendario illorum districtuum (sive sint de jure Cleri Saecularis) ubi Ecclesia nondum aedi-

ficata populus ad Sacra adunitus in aedificiis nonnisi transitorie ad cultum destinatis?

VI. Cum saepenumero eveniat (vi privilegii a Sancta Sede concessi) Canonicos Ecclesiae Cathedralis praepositos esse, cumcura animarum et onere residentiae, Ecclesiis dissitis nec a Cathedrali dependentibus, utrum a Canonico Rectore hujusmodi Officium divinum sit persolvendum juxta Kalendarium Ecclesiae cui hac ratione et stabili modo sive etiam vita perdurante ipse fuerit adscriptus?

VII. An Sacerdotes assistentes sive Vicarii teneantur in recitatione privata Divini Officii se conformare Kalendario Ecclesiae cui sunt addicti?

VIII. An liberum sit Canonico Rectori quamdiu hoc munere fungitur statuere pro arbitrio Kalendarium Cathedralis pro Kalendario Ecclesiae et Districtus Missionarii sive quasi Paroeciae, cui, ut supra, praeest, ne scilicet Missa ab Officio discrepet?

IX. Utrum Officium Vesperarum, Dominicis festisque diebus publice decantari solitum, ordinandum sit juxta Kalendrium Ecclesiae, in qua persolvitur: an potius concordandum cum Officio privatim recitando a Rectore Ecclesiae, partes, ut plurimum, hebdomadarii agente?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisito voto Commissionis Liturgicae, omnibusque mature perpensis, rescribendum censuit:

Ad I. Affirmative.

Ad II. Negative.

Ad III. Negative.

Ad IV. Affirmative.

Ad V. Kalendarium Dioecesanum adhibendum est.

Ad VI. Negative ad primam partem; Affirmative ad secundam.

Ad VII. Affirmative.

Ad VIII. Negative.

Ad IX. Affirmative ad primam partem; Negative ad secundam.

Itaque ita rescripsit die 4 Februarii 1898.

C. *Card* MAZZELLA, *Ep. Praenestinus, S. R. C. Praef.*

LETTER ADDRESSED BY THE S. CONGREGATION OF PROPAGANDA TO THE ORDINARIES OUTSIDE OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK, REGARDING THE FACULTIES TO BE EXTENDED TO CHAPLAINS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY.

Illmo e Rmo Signore :

Dalle notizie giunte a questa Sacra Congregazione risulta essersi richiesto dal governo degli Stati Uniti a Mons. Arcivescovo di New York che un Sacerdote sia destinato a Cappellano della Marina militare. Egli notificherà alla S. V. il nome del Sacerdote da lui a tal effetto prescelto. Il medesimo Prelato è autorizzato a dare al nuovo Cappellano le facoltà, che sono contenute nell' annesso foglio N. 1. Se partendo il detto Cappellano munito delle accennate facoltà sbarcherà nella sua Diocesi, egli dovrà presentarsi alla S. V. per riportarne la proroga finchè dimorerà nel suo territorio.

Qualora però non v'abbia alcuna ragione in contrario, si consiglia in generale che gli Ordinari sieno benigni nell' accogliere la persona, che presenta la formola d'approvazione del lodato Arcivescovo. Nell'accoglierlo poi il nuovo Ordinario è autorizzato a rinnovare le facoltà medesime nei termini che V. S. vedrà sotto il Num. II.

Convien poi che Ella rammenti come siffata concessione non deve applicarsi che alla persona scelta per assistere alla marina militare, essendo gli altri Ecclesiastici che si occupano pel bene spirituale dei soldati del luogo, parrochi o missionari locali, che non godono altre facoltà se non quelle date loro dal proprio Vescovo.

Tali sono le disposizioni approvate dalla Santità di N. S. a vantaggio spirituale dei cattolici addetti al servizio della Marina militare della republica degli Stati Uniti.

Che se Ella per gravi motivi si vedesse nella dura necessità di non prorogare a tal Cappellano le facoltà conferitegli, abbia il pensiero di avvertirne Mons. Arcivescovo di New

York, e le superiori autorità dell'Esercito di mare, astenendosi peraltro da qualsivoglia espressione che indichi i motivi di tal provvedimento, onde non sembri deferirsi in modo alcuno alle lodate autorità il giudicar del valore di siffati motivi. Essendo però annessi alcuni temporali vantaggi alla posizione del detto Cappellano militare, non conviene punto che il sacerdote delinquente se ne valga siccome pretesto a recar la questione del negato esercizio delle facoltà al giudizio dei Ministri, per le mani dei quali passano tali vantaggi, e perciò deve ogni Ordinario nel dare il consenso al Sacerdote suddetto di prestarsi come Cappellano, spiegargli bene e chiaramente che egli rimane sempre soggeto ai canoni, ed all'autorità dei soli Superiori Ecclesiastici per tutte, e singole le questioni spirituali, ed ecclesiastiche.

Monsig . . .
Vescovo di . . .
Vicario Apostolico . . .

Raccomandi poi bene spesso V. S. ai Cappellani l'occuparsi dell'istruzione religiosa dei fanciulli, che trovansi in pericolo per le vicende della guerra di restar privi dei loro genitori, e l'inculcare costantemente ai militari la più rispettosa venerazione al santo Nome di Dio, e la più tenera divozione verso l'Immacolata Vergine Madre di Dio, non che la sincera e leale fedeltà verso il governo della repubblica, la quale è richiesta non solo dall'onor militare, ma eziandio e molto più dai santi principii della religione cattolica, che hanno la felicità di professare.

Tanto avea a comunicare a V. S. e prego il Signore che la conservi e la prosperi.

Roma dalla Propaganda li....

Di V. S.

Come Fratello Affezionatissimo—

SPECIAL FACULTIES GRANTED TO THE CHAPLAINS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY.

NUM. I.

N. Dei et Apostolicae Sedis Gratia Episcopus N. . . .

Tibi dilecto Nobis in Christo . . . nostrae Dioecesis Sacerdoti, attento bono testimonio de vita, moribus aliisque requisitis nobis facto, potestatem tribuimus.

1. Praedicandi verbum Dei in Ecclesiis nostrae Dioecesis de consensu superiorum earumdem, pariter in Dioecesi nostra Confessiones Sacramentales Christifidelium excipiendi, non tamen Monialium, Oblatarum, puellarum, aliarumque in Monasteriis aut Conservatoriis degentium, et confitentibus, quantum spiritus et prudentia suggesserit pro qualitate criminum et poenitentium facultate, salutares et convenientes satisfactiones iniungendi, et beneficium absolutionis impendendi, praeterquam a censuris in Bulla *Apostolicae Sedis*, reservatis, monentes Te, ut quae pro recta huius Sacramenti administratione per Ss. Canones, Tridentinam Synodum, Constitutiones Apostolicas, praecipue summorum PP. Gregorii XV., et Benedicti XIV., contra sollicitantes ac Rituale Romanum sancita, vel alias ordinata accurate observes.

2. Absolvendi ab omnibus casibus et censuris Nobis reservatis.

3. Item ex speciali delegatione SSmi Domini Nostri Papae, absolvendi ab haeresi, et apostasia a fide, et a schismate, etiam Ecclesiasticos tam Saeculares, quam Regulares, et ab omnibus casibus Sedi Apostolicae reservatis, etiam in constitutione *Apostolicae Sedis* specialiter contentis, nunquam vero personam complicem in peccato turpi contra sextum Decalogi praeceptum commisso.

4. Item restituendi ius petendi debitum amissum.

5. Item dispensandi et commutandi in alia pia opera vota simplicia ex rationabili causa, exceptis tamen votis castitatis et religionis.

6. Item dispensandi, quando expedire videbitur, poenitentes milites, vel ad exercitum maritimum pertinentes super

esu carnium, ovorum, et lacticiniorum tempore ieiuniorum et Quadragesimae, vel aliis diebus abstinentiae per annum.

7. Item munia parochialia exercendi, atque Sacramenta parochialia administrandi in Sacellis et locis, in quibus milites et aliae personae ad exercitum maritimum ut supra pertinentes sacris adfuerint, ea tamen lege, quod in administratione Sacramenti matrimonii a Parocho, vel Missionario loci ubi versaris semper dependere debeas.

8. Item concedendi Indulgentiam plenariam primo conversis ab haeresi, atque etiam fidelibus quibuscumque in articulo mortis, qui saltem contriti sint, si confiteri nequeant.

9. Benedicendi *ad quinquennium* extra Urbem Coronas precatorias, Cruces, et sacra numismata, iisque applicandi indulgentias iuxta folium typis impressum atque insertum necnon D.Birgittae nuncupatas.

10. Benedicendi paramenta et alia utensilia ad Sacrificium Missae necessaria, ubi non interveniat unctio.

11. Recitandi matutinum cum laudibus diei sequentis duabus horis post meridiem elapsis, atque insuper recitandi Rosarium, si divinum officium ob aliquod legitimum impedimentum recitare non valeas.

12. Tenendi et legendi libros prohibitos ab Apostolica Sede etiam contra Religionem ex professo agentes, ad effectum eos impugnandi, quos tamen diligenter custodias ne ad aliorum manus deveniant, exceptis astrologicis, iudiciariis, superstitiosis, ac obscoenis.

13. Celebrandi Missam super altari portatili in terra in locis tamen, in quibus non adsint Ecclesiae, vel Oratoria privata, vel non pateat accessus ad Ecclesias, et per mare in navibus, et quatenus opus sit cum assistentia alterius Sacerdotis, dummodo sit aer serenum et mare tranquillum.

14. Faciendi Sacrum una hora ante auroram, vel una post meridiem.

15. Utendi indulto personali perpetuo altaris privilegiati ter in hebdomada, dummodo huius indulti intuitu nihil praeter consuetam eleemosynam percipias.

16. Vescendi per iter et in locis, ubi necessitas, ac salutis incommoda exegerint, carnibus, ovis, et lacticiniis in die

ieiunii, vel a tua Regula, vel ab Ecclesia praescripti, ita ut ob salutis incommoda etiam ab observantia ieiunii exemptus remaneas, omni tamen scandalo remoto.

17. Praesentibus valituris ad . . . intra Dioecesim nostram ; quod si e nostra Dioecesi ad aliam vocatus fueris, ut ibi militum saluti prospicias, Nos de speciali SSmi Domini Nostri Leonis PP. XIII. auctoritate sub die 4 Iulii, 1888, commissa, omnes et singulas facultates praedictas confirmamus tam pro tempore itineris a te una cum militibus peragendi, quam pro duobus mensibus a die in quo ad stationem exercitus tibi assignatam perveneris computandis, si pro locorum qualitate statim, vel paucos post dies sistere te commode minime poteris Ordinario loci, ut ab illo facultates easdem consequaris ; alias enim ad id te omnino teneri declaramus, cum eatenus tantum ad praedictos duos menses facultates tibi concessae intelligantur, quatenus iis reapse ob Ordinariorum absentiam vel distantiam indigueris, eoque tempore elapso omnem vim sint amissurae, nisi sit impossibilis etiam per nuntios, vel epistolas ad Ordinarium recursus, quo in casu et durante huiusmodi impossibilitate, Sanctitas Sua prorogationem dictarum facultatum tenore praesentium benigne concedit, onerata conscientia tua super veritate impossibilitatis.

18. Scias insuper te Ordinariis locorum in quibus propter curam spiritualem militum versari debueris in omnibus esse subiectum, et nullatenus tibi licere contra ipsorum decreta vel etiam facultatum privationem ad saecularis vel militaris auctoritatis praesidium confugere sub poenis et censuris in huiusmodi appellantes a iure latis.

EXTENSION OF FACULTIES OUTSIDE THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK.

NUM. II.

Utentes potestate nobis a SSmo Domino Nostro . . sub die 4 Iulii, 1888, facta, omnes et singulas facultates supra memoratas prorogamus et concedimus Tibi . . . ad

diem . . . intra Dioecesim nostram. Quod si interim extra Dioecesim ad novam Militum stationem vocatus fueris vim suam hae facultates habebunt tempore itineris, et per duos menses post diem adventus ad stationem praedictam sub conditionibus superius expressis et non ultra.

Datum.

CONSTITUTIONES APOSTOLICAE.

I.

CONST. CLEMENTIS VIII.

DE LARGITIONE MUNERUM REGULARIBUS UTRIUSQUE SEXUS INTERDICTA.

Clemens, Episcopus, etc.

Religiosae Congregationes ab insigni sanctitate viris Spiritus Sancti afflatu institutae, tantas Ecclesiae Dei utilitates omni tempore attulerunt, ut ad eas conservandas et instaurandas Romani Pontifices predecessores Nostri, magnam jure optimo diligentiam semper adhibuerint: nam cum ea sit rerum humanarum conditio et natura, ut etiam quae optime fundata et constituta sunt, partim hominum imbecillitate et ad malum proclivitate, partim daemonis astutia, paulatim deficiant, ac nisi cura pervigili sustententur, in deterius prolabantur; idcirco Summorum Pontificum vigilantia magnopere laboravit, ut regularium ordinum disciplina, aut labefactata in pristinum restitueretur, aut salutaribus constitutionibus communita, integra atque incolumis permaneret. Quorum Nos vestigiis pro eodem officii munere insistere, et pastoralem illorum sollicitudinem (quantum possumus) divina adjutrice gratia, cupimus imitari.

I. Quare, ne ex muneribus, quae a plurimis religiosae vitae professoribus ex Christi patrimonio, quibusvis hominibus quavis ex causa saepe tribuuntur, gravia incommoda et mala, etiam boni specie, existant, praecavere studentes, hac nostra perpetuo valitura constitutione universis et singulis cujuscun-

que ordinis Mendicantium vel non Mendicantium, bona immobilia et redditus certos ex indulto Apostolico possidentium vel non possidentium, seu cujusvis congregationis, societatis vel instituti (non tamen militiae) regularibus personis utriuslibet sexus omnem et quamcumque largitionem et missionem munerum penitus interdicimus; sub qua prohibitione comprehendi volumus omnia et singula capitula, conventus et congregationes, tam singularum conventuum, monasteriorum, prioratuum, praeposituarum, praeceptoriarum, domorum et locorum, quam provincialia aut generalia cujuslibet provinciae sive universi ordinis, societatis aut instituti; eorumque vel earum camerarios, commissarios et quoscumque officiales et singulas personas: ipsos etiam ordinum, congregationum et societatum hujusmodi superiores, quascumque dignitates obtinentes, etiam generales et provinciales, magistros, ministros et quocumque nomine praefectos, necnon conventuum, monasteriorum, prioratuum, praeposituarum, praeceptoriarum, domorum et locorum quorumcumque abbates, priores, praepositos, praeceptores, etiam majores, guardianos ministros, rectores atque abbatissas, priorissas et alio quovis titulo praesidentes, tam ipsis regularibus quam locorum ordinariis seu quibusvis superioribus subjectos utriuslibet sexus ad vitam vel ad tempus deputatos: adeo ut nemo unquam eorum vel earum directe vel indirecte, palam vel occulte tam communi quam particulari et proprio nomine, etiam sub quovis statuti vel consuetudinis, seu verius corruptelae, aut alio praetextu vel quacumque causa, nisi in generali capitulo, aut alia generali congregatione, re mature discussa, unanimi consensu omnium, superiorumque permissu causa approbata fuerit, quidquam tale attentare valeat.

2. Id autem ita absolute et generatim vetitum intelligatur, ut neque omnino fas sit quidquam donare, tam ex fructibus, redditibus, et proventibus, collectis, vel contributionibus, aut obligationibus, sive eleemosynis aut subsidiis certis vel incertis, ordinariis seu extraordinariis, mensae seu massae communis, vel cujusvis fabricae et sacristiae, quorum bona communiter, ut praefertur, administrantur, seu quae rationibus reddendis sunt obnoxia, quam ex pecuniis etiam, quae a

singulis quovis modo acquisitae in commune conferendae omnino sunt: nec si per viam voluntariae contributionis in commune congerantur: nec si forsan privatim et nominatim cuilibet religioso a suis superioribus vel a propriis affinibus, propinquis, familiaribus, amicis aut benevolis, vel a piis christifidelibus, etiam eleemosynae aut charitatis, et illius propriae personae intuitu attributae seu quoquomodo per quemlibet religiosum suo monasterio, domui aut loco acquisitae, eique, ut ad libitum de iis disponat, per superiores concessae fuerint, praeterquam leviora esculenta aut poculenta, seu ad devotionem vel religionem pertinentia munuscula communi tantum, numquam vero particulari nomine (ubi superiori de consensu conventus videbitur) tradenda.

3. Sed et hujusmodi missiones munerum ipsis religiosis utriuslibet sexus, non solum per se, verum etiam per alios tam directe quam indirecte prohibitas declaramus.

4. Neque vero quispiam ab hac generali prohibitione se excusare valeat, etiamsi munera miserit cuivis personae laicae vel ecclesiasticae cujuscumque status, gradus, dignitatis, ordinis vel conditionis, et quavis, non solum mundana et ducali, regia, imperiali, verum etiam ecclesiastica et Pontificali aut alia majori, etiam Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae cardinalatus dignitate fulgenti, etiam proprio loci Ordinario, etiam ex causa et occasione benedictionis vel susceptionis habitus regularis, tonsurae, aut professionis monialium, tam sibi subditarum quam non subditarum, aut ipsi etiam proprio ordinis vel congregationis protectori, vice protectori, generali vel principali aut cujusvis monasterii, prioratus, domus aut cujuslibet alterius loci regularis superiori, aut alio quocumque officio, munere aut dignitate fulgenti, vel cuicumque etiam simplici et particulari religioso; ita ut inter ipsos quoque religiosos (ne pravo ambitionis impulsu pro consequendis in sua religione gradibus et dignitatibus alter alterius gratiam et benevolentiam aucupetur) quaecumque largitio aut donatio munerum (nisi rerum minimarum de licentia expressa et in scriptis superiorum) sit penitus interdicta.

5. Insuper prohibemus ne unquam eisdem regularibus liceat ullas pecunias quoquomodo erogare in alicujus etiam benefactoris et protectoris vel Ordinarii honorem, etiam occasione transitus vel primi ingressus, aut ad beneficiorum acceptorum memoriam, gratique animi testificationem seu pro praedictis personis, quavis auctoritate vel dignitate fulgentibus honorifice, laute et opi pare excipiendis seu pro quibusvis conviviis eisdem aut cuivis illorum, quacumque occasione vel causa exhibendis vel pro comessationibus aut compotationibus quibusvis personis, tam ejusdem ordinis, congregationis, monasterii, domus aut loci, quam extraneis largiendis, aut pro exhibendis spectaculis etiam piis intra ecclesias, monasterii et domos sacras seu pias, vel extra eas, in quibusvis publicis aut privatis aut profanis locis, etiam ubi sanctorum et sanctarum vita aut res pie gestae, etiam in memoriam passionis Dominicae populis spectandae proponuntur, aut alias in praedictis, sive in quibusvis rebus supervacaneis, ad pompam et ostentationem aut ad oblectationem vel paucorum lucrum et privata commoda quomodolibet pertinentibus, nisi reipsa pro divino cultu et veris Christi pauperum indigentiis, servato in hoc charitatis ordine et habita necessitatis ratione, de consilio et consensu superiorum sublevandis, aut alias in rebus licitis, et per capitulum generale et provinciali non prohibitis, vel taxam ibi forsan praescriptam non excedentibus, sumptus hujusmodi fiant.

6. Declarantes tamen, per haec laudabilem et Apostolica doctrina sacrisque canonibus commendatam hospitalitatem, praesertim erga pauperes et peregrinos nequaquam imminui aut prohiberi. Quinimo si qui redditus ad id vel ex fundatione vel ex institutis, statutis aut consuetudinibus aliquorum monasteriorum, ordinum aut regularium hujusmodi locorum, aut ex testatorum vel donantium voluntatibus, sive alias applicati aut donati sunt, eos omnino (ut decet) integre in usus pios hospitalitatis hujusmodi erogandos esse, et praesertim in monasteriis seu locis desertis, et a laicorum aedibus longius remotis, ubi tamen pauperum et vere egenorum ratio in primis habeatur.

7. Si quos vero ditiores occasione transitus, sive alias ex devotionis aut necessitatis causa eo divertere contigerit, eos sane deceret refectorio communi cum religiosis, mensaque et ferculis communibus, nequaquam a caeteris distinctis contentos esse; verum omnino ipsi regulares in hospitibus hujusmodi potentioribus excipiendis ita se gerant, ut in eis frugalitas et paupertas religiosa prorsus eluceat.

8. Pari etiam ratione districte inhibemus, ne quispiam ex praedictis laicis alias, quam ut superius dictum est, vel clericus saecularis vel regularis quocumque honore, praeeminentia, nobilitate aut excellentia, etiam sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae cardinalatus dignitate praeditus, etiam protector, vice protector, loci Ordinarius, praelatus, generalis, provincialis, aut monasterii, domus vel loci cujuslibet superior, eorumve affines, propinqui, familiares aut ministri utriuslibet sexus, quidquam contra hanc superius expressam prohibitionem recipiant.

9. Quod si vel ab aliquo particulari religioso vel a superiore quopiam generali, provinciali aut alio quocumque munere fungente, aut a conventu, capitulo vel congregatione sive ab universo ordine et religione quidquam receperint, quod acceperint, suum non faciant; verum ipso facto, absque aliqua monitione judicis, decreto, sententia aut declaratione, ad illius restitutionem omnino in utroque foro teneantur, adeo ut, restitutione ipsa realiter non facta, neque etiam in foro conscientiae absolvi possint.

10. Hanc autem restitutionem fieri volumus non privatim ei religioso, qui donavit, sed ei monasterio, domui vel alteri loco, de cujus bonis facta est largitio, vel si non de ejus bonis donatum est, in quo idem religiosus donans professionem emisit, vel si nomine totius capituli, conventus aut congregationis vel universa ordinis seu religionis donatio facta exstiterit, pariter communi mensae aut massae, cujus nomine donatum fuerit, accepta munera restituantur, ita ut nec qui donavit, nec conventus, capitulum, congregatio, ordo vel religio, cui restitutio facienda est, illam remittere et iterum condonare aut recipientem ab obligatione restituendi eximere, vel ut in pauperes eroget, concedere quoquomodo possit.

11. Quod si quis ex supradictis regularibus utriuslibet sexus, cujuscumque gradus, ordinis, dignitatis, ac ubilibet locorum existentibus, conjunctim cum caeteris, seu divisim nostrarum hujusmodi prohibitionum, statutorum, ordinationum, jussionum, decretorum, mandatorum transgressor fuerit, statuimus, ut omnibus et singulis per eum obtentis dignitatibus, gradibus, muneribus et officiis, eo ipso privatus, ac ad illa similia vel dissimilia in futurum obtinenda inhabilis perpetuo, et incapax, ac perpetua infamia et ignominia notatus existat; et praeterea privationem vocis activae et passivae, absque ullo superioris decreto aut ministerio, ipso facto incurrat; necnon ultra hujusmodi poenas, etiam tamquam contra furti et simoniae criminum reum, tam per viam denunciationis, accusationis aut querelae, quam etiam ex officio procedi et inquiri, condignisque suppliciis affici debeat.

12. Poenis aliis a jure statutis ac per alias constitutiones Apostolicas aut propria cusjuvis ordinis, congregationis, monasterii, domus aut loci statuta vel consuetudines contra personas aliquid praemissorum committentes, forsan decretis et inflictis nihilominus in suo robori permansuris.

13. Quocirca universis et singulis modernis, et pro tempore existentibus locorum Ordinariis eorumque vicariis et officialibus, necnon quorumcumque ordinum, prioratuum, monasteriorum et domorum superioribus, etiam generalibus seu provincialibus, caeterisque, ad quos spectat, per Apostolica scripta mandamus, quatenus ipsi et eorum singuli, quantum ad eos pertinet, curent omni studio, diligentia, auctoritate et vigilantia, praesertim constitutionem firmiter et inviolate observari et contra inobedientes vel transgressores condignis poenis animadverti; eosdem inobedientes necnon contradictores quoslibet et rebelles per opportuna juris et facti remedia, appellatione postposita, compescendo, invocata etiam ad hoc, si opus fuerit, auxilio brachii saecularis.

14. Non obstantibus constitutionibus, etc.

15. Volumus autem ut praesentes litterae in valvis Sancti Joannis Lateranen. et Principis Apostolorum de Urbe basilicarum et in acie campi Florae publicentur, affixis inibi

earum exemplis et dimissis; quodque earum exempla seu illarum compendia in libris quorumcumque statutorum praedictorum monasteriorum, prioratuum, collegiorum, domorum, ordinum et congregationum (quod moniales in vernaculum et vulgarem cujusque regionis sermonem versa), et a loci Ordinario, qui id quamprimum fieri curet, subscripta inservantur, et saltem quotannis in capitulis sive congregationibus cujusque earum alta et intelligibili voce legantur; et nihilominus post sexaginta dies a die publicationis (ut praefertur) in Rom. curia facienda, unumquemque citra montes, ultra montes vero, post quatuor menses perinde arctent et afficiant, ac si cuique personaliter intimatae et per eos juratae fuissent.

16. Quodve earum transumptis, etc.

Nulli ergo omnino, etc.

Datum Romae, in monte Quirinali anno Incarnationis Dominicae 1594, 13 Kal. Julii, Pontificatus anno tertio.

L. *Card. prodat.* M. VESTRIUS BARBIANUS.

A. DE ALEXUS.

II.

CONSTITUTIO URBANI VIII.

IN QUA PRAECEDEN. MODERATUR ET CONFIRMATUR.

Urbanus Papa VIII., etc.

I. Nuper a congregatione nonnullorum Romanae curiae praelatorum coram dilecto filio nostro Antonio tituli S. Petri ad Vincula presbytero cardinali S. Onuphrii nuncupato, majori poenitentiario, ac Nostro in Alma Urbe provicario in spiritualibus generali et Nostro secundum carnem fratre germano a Nobis deputata, emanavit declaratio tenoris subsequentis, videlicet:

Cum circa interpretationem constitutionis fel. rec. Clementis VIII. sub dat. xiii Kal. Julii, pontificatus sui anno tertio, de largitione munerum regularibus utriusque sexus interdicta, nonnullae difficultates et ambiguitates sint exortae; coram eminentissimo cardinali S. Onuphrii majori

poenitentiario ac Urbis provicario deputata, auctoritate sibi attributa declaravit et declarat, munera a religiosis utriusque sexus tribui posse ex causis gratitudinis, conciliationis, benevolentiae, ejusque conservationis erga ipsam religionem vel conventum, aliisve causis ex sui natura actum virtutis ac meriti continentibus, modeste tamen ac discrete, et dummodo id non fiat nisi de superiorum localium licentia, ac etiam cum consensu majoris partis conventus, si talis consensus de jure, vel ex constitutionibus seu consuetudinibus cujusque religionis respective, in hujusmodi casibus requiratur; consensum vero conventus in § 2. ejusdem constitutionis ad leviora esculenta aut poculenta seu ad devotionem et religiositatem pertinentia munuscula largienda, etc., requisitum, intelligi debere de consensu de jure requisito, et ubi concurrit ambitionis suspicio, qua cessante nec in his requiri licentiam superiorum in § 4. ejusdem bullae requisitam, sed sufficere licentiam, etiam oretenus eis concessam, declarat; comessationes autem, compotationes et convivia, in excipiendis benefactoribus, protectoribus vel Ordinariis honorifice et laute, de quibus in § 5 et 6 ejusdem constitutionis, censeri tantummodo prohibita, si decentiae status regularis adversentur; restitutionem vero receptorum conventibus faciendam, de qua in § 10, ibidem cautum est, intelligi debere de conventibus ad quos data vel missa de jure pertinent, si id commode fieri potest, alias conventui ejusdem religionis viciniori loco, ubi petita fuit absolutio, restituantur.

Insuper eadem facultate sibi tributa, omnes qui hucusque adversus praedictae constitutionis capitula hic moderata largiti fuerunt vel receperunt, a poenis quibuscumque in eadem constitutione inflictis et incursis posse et debere a propriis confessariis absolvi in foro conscientiae, etiam non facta prius hujusmodi rerum donatarum seu datarum restitutione: quoad eos vero, qui praeter modum praedictum graviori religionis detrimento largiendo vel recipiendo transgressi sunt, sed ob inopiam restituere nequeunt, eadem Sanctitas concedit majori poenitentiario, ut de praeteritis usque ad diem datae praesentium in foro conscientiae ab-

solvat, dispenset et condonet seu absolvi, dispensari et condonari mandet, prout in Domino magis expedire judicaverit.

2. Et ne praedictae Clementis VIII. constitutionis memoria dilabatur, superiores locales cujuscumque monasterii, conventus, domus ac Collegii regularis, sub poena privationis officii, vocisque activae et passivae ipso jure incurrenda, efficere teneantur, ut in perpetuum singulis annis mense Januario, non solum praedicta constitutio, quam in reliquis ejus partibus eadem Sanctitas omnino observari jubet, et quatenus opus est, innovat (quemcumque praetensum non usum, seu praetensum usum, seu praetensam consuetudinem damnando et irritando), verum etiam hoc decretum in aliqua publica congregatione, vel saltem in publica mensa perlegatur; omnibus tamen ecclesiasticis personis, etiam regularibus, quam laicis cujuscumque sint ordinis, conditionis, gradus ac dignitatis etiam speciali nota dignis, et qui sub generali dispositione non comprehenderentur, praedictam Clementis constitutionem contra praesentis decreti tenorem declarandi vel interpretandi facultate penitus interdicta, super quibus Sanctissimus mandavit expediri Breve, datum Romae die decima quinta Septembris 1640.

3. Quapropter, ut promissa firmius subsistant, et inviolabiliter observentur, quantum cum Domino possumus, providere volentes, motu proprio et ex certa scientia ac matura deliberatione Nostris deque Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine, declarationem praeinsertam cum omnibus et singulis in ea contentis tenore praesentium perpetuo confirmamus et approbamus illique inviolabiliter Apostolicae firmitatis robur adjicimus, ac omnes et singulos, tam juris quam facti defectus, si qui desuper quomodolibet intervenerint, supplemus, illaque inviolabiliter ab omnibus, ad quos spectat et spectabit in futurum, observari.

4. Sicque, et non aliter, etc.

5. Non obstantibus, etc.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctam Mariam Majorem, sub annulo Piscatoris, die xvi. Octobris 1840, Pontificatus nostri anno decimo octavo.

CONFERENCES.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

THE JURISDICTION OF CHAPLAINS IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY.

There are at present several priests engaged in the service of the United States as chaplains regular to the national army and navy.

To those who have the spiritual care of the Catholics on board of the Government vessels the Holy See has granted exceptional faculties which will be found in another part of this number of the REVIEW. As our marines frequently move from port to port and are thus brought under different episcopal jurisdiction, a question naturally arises as to the relative rights of bishops to exact conformity on the part of the military to the diocesan ordinances established in their respective territory.

The Holy See has accordingly taken steps to define the limits of jurisdiction in such a way as to avoid all conflict or misunderstanding. The Sacred Congregation states that the right of presenting to the Government the chaplain to be appointed for our naval troops belongs exclusively to the Archbishop of New York. The latter also assigns to the priest the requisite faculties for the valid and legitimate exercise of his priestly functions. These "Faculties" are distinctly specified. (See *Analecta*, pag. 404. Docum. No. I.)

According to the instructions accompanying his "Faculties" it is the duty of the chaplain whenever the marine forces anchor anywhere outside of the Diocese of New York to present himself to the local Ordinary as soon as possible after landing, and to obtain from the latter an official en-

dorsement of the faculties given him by the Archbishop of New York. The form of this endorsement is likewise given (No. II). It prolongs the original "Faculties" not only for the time during which the troops remain within the territory of the Bishop (or Vicar Apostolic), but also for the time of their subsequent journey, including two months after their arrival at a new station.

The Bishops and Vicars Apostolic having within their territory seaports where our troops are likely to land, have been notified of this arrangement, and they are requested to accord every facility to the chaplain for the proper exercise of his functions. The Archbishop of New York is moreover expected to keep the Ordinaries in different landing places informed regarding any change made by him in the appointment or the use of special faculties, since the latter are exceptional and cannot be extended to priests in general, not even those who may regularly minister to the spiritual wants of the soldiers.

If the Ordinary of any place should for legitimate reason find himself compelled to refuse to the chaplain the extension of his faculties he is to communicate the fact at once to the Archbishop of New York. He is likewise to notify the proper authorities of the United States Navy Department that the chaplain is suspended; but in doing so the Bishop is not to assign any reasons for his action which might provoke a contention between the spiritual and secular authorities as to the validity of episcopal jurisdiction. The S. Congregation advises that the officers of the Government should be made clearly to understand from the beginning that a priest, though he receives his salary from the State, remains in all things which concern spiritual jurisdiction (and the qualifications for the proper exercise of his religious functions) subject to the established statutes and authority of his Church. It is only on such condition that the candidate is presented for the office of chaplain to the troops. In case of delinquency a chaplain would thus have no appeal to the military authority against his ecclesiastical superiors, on the ground that the Government pays his salary.

WAS IT GOOD LUCK OR INJUSTICE?

Qu. Peter and John are two farmers. Peter after much time and labor, assures himself that in John's farm there are valuable mineral deposits. He keeps his knowledge to himself, and induces John to sell him the farm, paying a few dollars an acre for it, its price in open market. In this way he becomes the owner of very valuable mines. Does he sin against justice in so doing?

NEO-SACERDOS.

Resp. Peter has become the owner of lucrative mines through good fortune, which his wits and industry courted. And in this he committed no injustice against John.

The just price of a thing is that which common estimation or a legal valuation attaches to it. In the present case the commonly estimated value of the land was that for which it could be bought in open market. The particular knowledge of its probable future value, arising from its being mined instead of farmed, does not alter the common or legal estimate of its value, nor is Peter bound to communicate this knowledge which he obtained by personal industry. "Pretium justum rei," says Palmieri-Ballerini, following St. Alphonsus, "facit communis existimatio seu legalis taxa; scientia autem tua privata neutram tollit." (*Opus Mor.*, vol. IV., tract. viii., p. 3, c. 2.) In the same place the author cites St. Thomas as saying, "Venditor qui vendit rem secundum pretium quod invenit, non videtur contra justitiam facere, si quod futurum est, non exponat." What is true of the vendor is equally applicable to the purchaser. St. Thomas adds that generosity might induce the party possessing the knowledge which gives a subsequent higher value to the object sold, to manifest the advantage or loss, "quamvis ad hoc non videtur teneri ex justitiae debito." (Ibid.

It is true that the value of the ground is in this case intrinsic to the farm; but of this Peter could not be so certain at the time of purchase as to render his title to it at the price demanded, doubtful. Though he feels assured that there are mines beneath, his knowledge is gained from indications

which may be reasonably supposed to be within the reach of the owner of the farm, even if the latter does not actually suspect it, or take the trouble to ascertain the fact. The case is therefore different from that of a purchaser who knowing that another possesses a precious gem which the owner believes to be but a common stone, obtains it at a low price; for here there is certain knowledge as the basis of deception and injury. John sustains no injury by the sale, though he might have profited by the right use of his farm; Peter earns the legitimate fruit of industry and foresight; but he also runs a risk of spending much labor in vain, since what appears to be a lucrative mine, may turn out to be but a scant vein of ore. In common justice Peter seems rightly entitled to the profit of the land, just as if he had sown in that farm some kind of produce which he foresaw would be in great demand, and enrich him.

THE QUESTION OF INCARDINATION ACCORDING TO THE COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

REPLY

By Prof. Jules De Becker, D.D., University of Louvain.

Permit me to answer the objection raised by the Rev. Dutto concerning my interpretation of Decree 66, of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore.

In the first place I would premise that my opponent's general assertion that "the decision must be based *exclusively* on the decrees enacted by the Third Plenary Council," should be so understood as *not to exclude* the general law of the Church which regulates the canonical adoption of clerics; for it is clear that any private interpretation of the text of the Baltimore Council which *contradicts the common law* is to be rejected as "uncanonical."

But what of the principal argument of Fr. D., namely, that there exists a necessary connection between the two kinds

of adoption, the *formalis* and the *praesumptiva*, which makes the latter "a negative" of the former, and places Decrees 66 and 63 in the corresponding position of a negative and a positive declaration.

I am quite willing to admit that there exists a close connection between the two kinds of adoption inasmuch as both produce the same juridical effects, and require the same essential conditions as to the consent of the interested parties,—although there is a considerable difference in the way in which this consent is manifested.[1] Moreover there is this connection between the two methods of adoption, that, *under certain circumstances* (not under all) a presumptive adoption obtains when the conditions of a formal adoption are not verified. But beyond this we cannot go in pressing this connection by asserting that the presumptive adoption takes place *whenever* there is no formal adoption or as though it were to be interpreted according to the dispositions which the Council laid down for formal adoption. Indeed since the Fathers speak of the two kinds of adoption under distinct and separate decrees we have no right to transfer what is said under one to that of the other, unless special reasons call for it in order to avoid contradiction regarding one and the same law. My critic insists on the necessary connection between the two decrees in order to show that the words of Decree 66 which unmistakably refer only to the "*triennium elapsum*," are to be understood in the light of Decree 63 in which the Bishops are advised to give notice to the priest "*antequam triennium expiret.*" For, as he says, "what necessity of stating that . . . *ante triennium*, if it did not mean to decree

1 It is not quite correct to say: "The only essential difference between . . . is that the latter lacks the written incardination of the Bishop;" for the essential ground of difference between the two kinds of adoption is the different manner in which the will of the bishop manifests itself in each case respectively; in the case of formal adoption the will of the bishop to adopt a priest must be manifested formally and expressly (either in actual writing or, as I suggested, in some other outward manner); in the case of presumptive adoption the manifestation of the bishop's will is gathered from a complex of circumstances determined by the Fathers of the Council in Decree 66, although not mentioned in Decree 63.

that, unless the Bishop did notify the priest 'antequam triennium expiret' the *adoptio praesumptiva* would go into effect?" The objection thus takes for granted there is no other convenient way of explaining this disposition according to the opinion expressed by me. This is not the case; for the aforesaid disposition accords very well with the whole context of Decree 63, even though no allusion whatever is made to presumptive adoption. That decree, which treats *ex professo only concerning the formal adoption*, states the regular term of three years allowed by way of experiment, and within which term the Bishop may either expressly adopt, or expressly reject or else adopt a middle way of deferring a definitive decision by prolonging the time of probation beyond the ordinary term. Surely natural equity itself would demand that before entering upon this new and unusual prolongation of the term of trial, the priest should be notified by the bishop. Wherefore, even if it were permitted to doubt whether this law which is couched in the form of a precept, is also *irritans*, it is plain that there is a perfect coherence between the dispositions of the law ordaining that the Bishops *in the case of formal adoption* must *within the prescribed three years* either accept the priest definitely or give him due notice of the fact that he intends to prolong his time of probation.

Nor have we to look in this text for a solution of the question which the Fathers intended to deal with in Decree 66, where they speak *ex professo* of presumptive adoption and define its conditions. The words of this Decree 66 are quite clear and require no explanation from the context of another decree which treats of a different aspect of the subject. According to this new law the *ratio* of presuming upon the consent of the adopting bishop is simply this: "Qui *elapso tempore* (triennii vel quinquennii) clericum nec formaliter admittit, nec admittere plane diserteque recusat, jure praesumitur adscripsisse." Ergo, si *vix elapso triennio* episcopus clericum admittere plane diserteque recusat, ruit tota praesumptio quam ipse legislator indicavit tamquam fundamentum suae legis. I need hardly dwell on the sug-

gestion made by my critic that the writer of the decree was a poor hand at Latin, inasmuch as he wrote twice "elapso" for "labente" or "currente." If, as he himself says, "that is all," I confess that it is not enough to make any difference here. The Council of Baltimore is not the work of an obscure scribe ignorant of the rudiments of Latin, but it represents the acts of the combined Episcopate of the United States and of the Holy See, under whose authority and supervision the decrees of the Fathers were prepared and afterwards sanctioned (recognoverit et probaverit). Would that all the texts of our legislation were written in the style of Latinity which Fr. Dutto finds fault with!

Hence, so long as the interpretation which I have offered is not declared "entirely erroneous" by a doctrinal exposition based on solid arguments, or by an authentic interpretation from the legislative body which represents the Council of Baltimore, or by the Holy See, it stands on good reasons of probability.

THE BORROWER OF BOOKS.

Here are a few odd lines which may be amusing or useful to clerical friends who are in possession of good libraries from which their neighbors as well as themselves gather profit. The verses are mostly from medieval sources (as the Latinity suggests), found on book plates or written on the fly-leaf for the purpose of deterring the habitual purloiner (derived from *prolonger*, *i. e.*, one who keeps a thing too long), as well as the ecclesiastical communist from forgetting to restore them in good season and condition.

Some of the classical anathemas are rather hard on the culprit, ex. gr.:

Si quis hunc librum rapiat scelestus
Atque furtivis manibus prehendat,
Pergat ad tetras Acherontis undas,
Non rediturus.

Tu cave sacrilego memet subducere furto
Ni pravi furis nomen habere velis.
(A. D. 1690.)

Est liber ille meus, caveas deponere loco,
Si mihi sustuleris, fur tibi nomen erit.
(A. D. 1581,)

Hic liber est meus,
Testis est Deus
Si quisquis furetur
Per collum pendetur.

The last line of the foregoing stanza suggests the figure of man hung upon a gibbet, which formed at one time a favorite emblem for library book plates. The following mixed French and Latin verse accompanies one such:

Aspice *Pierrot pendu*
Quod librum *n'a pas rendu*,
Pierrot pendu non fuisset
Si librum reddidisset.

A similar one, mixed German and Latin reads:

Hic liber est *mein*
Ideo nomen meum scripsi *drein;*
Si vis hunc librum *stehlen*,
Pendebis *an der Kehlen;*
Tunc veniunt *die Raben*
Et volunt tibi oculos *ausgraben.*
Tunc clamabis: *Ach, ach, ach!*
Ubique tibi recte *geschach!*

Among the *Leges Bibliothecae* of the last century, mentioned by Count Leiningen Westerburg in a treatise on the subject, are the following quaint warnings against mutilating or defacing borrowed books.

1. Hunc ne mancipium ducito—*liber* est: ne igitur notis compungito.
2. Ne corsim punctimve ferito: hostis non est.
3. Lineolis intus, forisve, quaquaversum, ducendis abstineto.
4. Folium ne subigito, ne complicato, neve in rugas cogita.
5. Ad oram conscribillare caveto.
6. Alteri clanculum palamve ne commodato.
7. Ab aqua, oleo, igne, situ, illuvie arceto.
8. Eodem utitor, non abutitor.
9. Legere, et quaevis excerpere fas esto.
10. Perlectum apud te perennare ne sinito.
11. Sartum tectumque prout tollis, reddito.

WHICH OFFICE OF THE SPINEA CORONA D. N. J. C. FOR THE UNITED STATES?

To the Editor of the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

Qu. Will you please call attention in your pages to a matter which I think will be of interest and of benefit to the clergy who read your valuable REVIEW.

In the Baltimore *Ordo*, March 4th, fer. 6, "Spineae Coronae D. N. J. C.," the office is indicated as being found in supplemento fer. 6 post Cineres. That would require a return to the Pars Hiemalis of the Breviary. When therefore in the American supplement in Pars Verna I found the office Spineae Coronae fer. 6 post Dom. I Quad. I used it. In saying Mass I noticed that the prayer in the Missal was different from that of the Office and on comparing notes I found the following facts: The Office in Pars Hiemalis for the Friday after Ash Wednesday is quite a different arrangement from that found in the American supplement for the Friday after the first Sunday in Lent. This latter Office appears in the Tournai editions of *1892* and *1896* which are marked respectively as the *second* and *ninth* editions *Post Typicam*.

The only Missals I have at hand to consult are the Pustet editions *Typica* and *Quinta post Typicam* (1892), neither of which have the Mass corresponding to the Office which appears in the American supplement of the other editions.

Perhaps you have some information to give which will clear up these discrepancies and show us where the error is, for surely there is a mistake in either one or other of the editions above mentioned.

Resp. The office *Spineae Coronae* in the Appendix (pro aliquibus locis Stat. Foeder.) of the Tournai edition is taken from the *Proprium pro Hibernia*, and found in some of the Breviaries published in France (ex. gr., Lyons and Paris, 1847, Libr. Cath. de Perisse Fr.). It is not improbable that the proposal to adopt this Office among others for the United States at the fourth Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1840, had its origin in the fact that many priests had been accustomed to say it in Ireland. However, as it is not the special text designated *pro aliquibus locis* in the Roman editions of the Breviary, and as the S. Congr. of Propaganda in its decree approving the adoption of the feast for the United States added the injunction "rubricarum praescripto diligenter servato", we must assume that it desired us to use the text as "pro Urbe et ubi specialiter concessum" designated. The Paschal Office of the same feast celebrated in some places after *Dominica in Albis* has the identical prayer as the Lenten Office. The same is true of the special office used by the Redemptorist Fathers which differs in some other respects from the Roman.

EPISCOPAL VOUCHERS FOR THE PURITY OF ALTAR WINES.

(*Communication from a Wine Merchant.*)

A priest has called my attention to the articles in the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW on the use of certain wines for the altar, and on their cure by means of alcohol, (Vols. IV., V., VIII., and IX.). I have also carefully gone over the analytical table by your expert chemist, testing various grades of wine sold for sacramental purposes. My experience in dealing with the clergy fully bears out what is said in those articles, and I am also willing to corroborate the statement made in the March number of the same REVIEW, namely, that only the personal integrity of a producer can serve as a guarantee to the clergy that they receive pure wines of the ripe grape such as is required by the canons of the Catholic Church for Mass.

But what kind of guarantee do you demand as security? I know two Jewish commission merchants who have letters of recommenda-

tion from several bishops and influential priests. They sell wine which I know to be adulterated—that is, "doctored," as we say, though made of the grape. The agent, in one case at least, is a Catholic, whose honesty I do not doubt, but who *knows nothing about the production* of the wine which he recommends to priests, except that his employers receive periodical invoices of casks labelled "altar" from the vineyards. The agent sends in to the firm his orders, obtained upon letters of recommendation from the bishop and priests stating in general terms, that Mr. N. N. is known to them as an honorable business man and that they believe him to sell pure altar wine. Now, as such letters are non-committal, and can be obtained, as everybody knows, at the urging of any respectable business man who knows how to present his request, they are *absolutely worthless.* I am sure that several viticulturists have offered to do the best they can to satisfy the clergy in furnishing pure altar wine; but they are "cut out" by plausible agents of second-hand dealers. All the agitation aiming at securing pure wine for the altar seems to me useless unless a plan can be proposed and accepted by which the bishops give their testimony to wine merchants *not merely upon the generally known integrity of a firm or agent,* but, upon affidavit of the producer, with a forfeit attached which will be recognized at public law. Whether such a plan is practicable or not, I do not, of course, propose to say, but it is the only *safe* plan for obtaining the desired altar wine, except where a priest cultivates his own vineyard or directly supervises the production of wine from the grape.

Resp. The above is one out of several remonstrances which have come to us since first the question of pure altar wines was agitated in the REVIEW, in consequence of a public and wholesale fraud perpetrated upon a considerable number of priests who felt themselves obliged to "restitution," owing to doubts about the validity of the Sacrifice, etc. It must be admitted that there has been a great laxity of supervision—in view of the facility with which imposition may be practised by agents who, if they are not unscrupulous, are often insufficiently alive to the importance of the question involved in the sale of wine to be used for the Holy Sacrifice.

It is not perhaps so difficult as may appear at first sight, to secure safety in this important matter of purchasing pure

wine for the altar. There are in the first place the guarantees of prelates who, like the Bishop of Rochester, have placed the production of the altar wine under the immediate supervision of responsible priests. This is quite in keeping with the methods of the Levitic Law in the Old Testament, and forestalls the possibility of deception and abuse. Any priest purchasing wine from such sources is secure against imposition. Next we have certain religious communities, such as the Trappists, etc., who devote themselves to the cultivation of the soil, and secure a pure altar wine. Lastly we have a number of wine producers whose education and known integrity as practical Catholics are confirmed by testimony under oath before a public notary, vouching for the purity of the product sold under the name of altar wine. These men are supposed to understand fully the requirements of the Church for the Holy Sacrifice, and also what importance she attaches to the scrupulous observance of the requirement.

The solemn contract (publicly ratified) between the merchant and those who purchase altar wines from him, throws the responsibility of restitution upon the former and relieves priests from any anxiety as to having taken the proper precautions for securing pure fermented juice of the ripe grape. There are numerous communities of religious men and women who have to rely on the recommendations of the bishop; yet the latter himself has but the most slender guarantee that he is using the prescribed matter for the Holy Sacrifice.

Now it is worthy of note that, apart from individual instances, there is no country in the world where less formality is observed to safeguard the sacramental rites than the United States; yet there is no country where imposition is so common a danger. But although artificial food-products (not excluding wine) are put upon the market in every form, there is a protection against the sale of fictitious and adulterated food stuffs, in public legislation and the vigilance of private societies. The demand for a similar guarantee on the part of the Church authorities in matters which are infi-

nitely more important than bodily health can not be deemed an exaggerated precaution. In Europe the bishops as a rule demand from wine producers an affidavit sworn to before two or three diocesan officials and a notary public. We have before us a certificate which exemplifies in what form the clergy are assured of obtaining pure wine for the altar.

NOS CAROLUS
Miseratione Divina et Sanctae Sedis Apostolicae Gratia
EPISCOPUS . . . . .
Protonotarius Apostolicus a. i. p.
attestamur, dioecesanum nostrum Theodorum H . . .
VIRUM PIETATE ET FIDE COMMENDABILEM, JUSJURANDUM EMISISSE,
se vinum ad SS. Sacrificii Missae celebrationem
adhibendum nonnisi omnino purum,
ingenuum, ex vite se inspiciente expressum
venditurum esse et huic jurijurando hucusque,
in quantum scimus, jam per duo fere dece nia
praecipua fide stetisse.
Dabamus . . . in Curia nostra episcopali die 10 Decembris 1897.
L. † S. ✠ CAROLUS.

In this document the Ordinary attests that the merchant is an honorable business man and a devout Catholic, who has taken an oath that he will not sell wine to be used for the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice, unless he knows from personal inspection (se inspiciente) that it is absolutely pure and of the true grape. The Bishop furthermore adds that he believes the merchant to have fulfilled his sworn promise faithfully during the last twenty years.

On the page following this attestation of the Bishop is printed the *affidavit* signed by the merchant in the presence of N. N., stating that in accordance with the Rescript published by the Ordinary relating to the requisite purity of Mass wine, he is ready to make oath that he will faithfully observe the provisions of the Rescript. Having been admonished regarding the sanctity and solemn binding force of the

oath, he swore as follows: I hereby declare under oath before God the Almighty and Omniscient, that in answer to all demands for altar wine I will deliver only pure wine pressed from the ripe grape under my personal supervision. So help me God and His holy Gospel.

Signed THEODORE H . . .
Witnessed as above { N. N. Capit. Cathedr.
N. N. Vicar. Cap. Cathedr.
(Copy testified to by L. M.)

Then follows the text of a communication previously addressed to the wine producer, setting forth what is deemed permissible in the treatment of altar wines, for instance, the mixture of different grades (provided they be all the product of the pure grape), the "matching" of casks, etc.; forbidding the addition of certain quantities of sugar, spirits, flavors (essence bouquet), coloring substances, glycerine, addition of water, heating of the wine to 40° Reaumur, treatment with tannin, salicyl acid, magnesia, etc., for artificial clearing, etc. Every priest of the diocese receives this printed form. The endorsements of other bishops of Belgium and Holland follow to the same effect, together with certain cautions and decrees from the S. Congregation for the guidance of the clergy. Thus the wine merchant is *officially authorized* to provide the *materia non solum valida sed digna* for the altar. The patronage thus honorably acquired enables him to employ the very best methods to produce good wine, whilst the clergy are freed from all anxiety regarding the purity of the article.

No doubt, the ecclesiastical authorities will eventually take the matter in hand and demand a more formal security than is for the most part given, which would be the best and only method of protecting the sanctity of the Holy Sacrifice, as well as the interests of the clergy and people in dioceses of the United States. Until then the safest way for us is to get our altar wine from the vineyards managed under the immediate care of ecclesiastics.

THE SKULL AND CROSS-BONES AT THE FOOT OF THE CRUCIFIX.

Qu. What is the origin and meaning of the skull and cross-bones on crucifixes? I have seached for an explanation, but everywhere in vain.

Resp. According to a very old tradition (Detzel, *Iconographie*, chap. iv., pg. 422), Adam, the father of the human race, was buried on the spot where our Lord died. A similar tradition has it that a sprig of the tree of life which Adam took from Paradise and planted as a lasting remembrance of his transgression in the place where he wished to be buried, became the wood from which the cross of our Redeemer was fashioned. Thus the tomb of Adam was identified with the spot on the mount of Calvary on which the cross was raised. So art has represented it for centuries, and the skull and bones of our first parent are placed there to indicate that they (and the whole race of man) receive new life through the death of Christ: *Ecce resurgit Adam cui dat Deus in cruce vitam.* (Inscript. cruc., in the Cathdral of Chur, in St. Ulricus at Augsburg, etc.)

THE MYSTERIES IN THE RECITATION OF THE BEADS.

Qu. Which is the proper way to say the beads? To announce the mystery before each decade or to repeat it with each Hail Mary? If one or the other method be right exclusively, is the indulgence lost by using any other?

Resp. Both methods are right in so far as they suggest, only in different ways, the subject of meditation during the recital of the prayers, in which meditation is the condition of gaining the indulgences. No doubt the repetition of the mystery in connection with each separate *Ave* renders the devout recital easier in many cases; but there are good reasons for the other method which custom has equally sanctioned.

ECCLESIASTICAL MUSIC AGAIN.

I have read with interest the statement in the March number of the REVIEW (Conf. p. 293), made by Father Becker with respect to the teaching of Plain Chant in Salesianum College and Seminary. May I point out here that he does not refer to the special difficulty suggested in my article on this matter? The important point of my query was if any seminary required any musical test in the *entrance examination;* and if not, whether a defective ear was given that special attention outside of class-work, which is necessary for fitting every student to sing the essential chants properly. To say that "*all* students . . . partake in the theoretical and practical instructions in sacred music" does not quite reach my difficulty. I might state my question in this form: Is *any* student ordained who is unable to sing the essential chants properly (*i. e.*, with respect both to correctness and voice-culture)? The course of music in Overbrook Seminary is very much the same as that sketched by Father Becker. All the students receive theoretical and practical instruction in music—that is to say, *all* must attend the classes in which such instruction is given. Class-work is not able, I think, to remove the defects of "ear" and "voice" such as Father Bewerunge of Maynooth alluded to, and such as are met, I presume, in all seminaries. H. T. HENRY.

PICTURES OF THE RESURRECTION.

(*Correspondence.*)

When Jesus rose from the dead early on Easter morning, He passed through the stone wall of the tomb, passed by the guards who were watching the rock that closed its mouth, and after He had gone, the guards still thought that the tomb still held His dead body. He went through the wall of the sepulchre just as He went, that same night, through the walls of the house in which His disciples were gathered

together. After Christ had risen there was an earthquake, and an angel appeared and lifted the great stone from the mouth of the sepulchre. The terrified guards heard and felt the earthquake, saw the angel, looked into the tomb, saw it empty and fled away.

A picture of the RESURRECTION should represent a great stone against the opening in the sepulchre; the guards should be represented looking at it and wide-awake, and Christ should appear passing through the stone. There should be no angel, for he did not come until after Christ had arisen.

Another picture which we may call AFTER THE RESURRECTION should represent the angel hurling the stone away, should show the tomb empty, and the terrified guards looking at the angel and into the empty tomb.

I have been looking for a picture of "*The Resurrection*" and not one of "*After the Resurrection*," but so far I have not found it. I have looked in art stores, in Catholic publishing houses, in books, at numbers of Rosary tickets, but all in vain. What is usually found is a combination of "*The Resurrection*" and "*After the Resurrection.*" Not being able to find what I wanted and wishing to put a stained-glass window of the Resurrection into my church—for I had all the other mysteries of the Rosary represented—I told the artist to show the sealed tomb, the guards awake standing near it, and Christ coming through the stone that closed the entrance to it. Christ passing through the rock, did not come out as satisfactorily as I wished, for the figure of Christ appeared too dim in the centre of the great stone door. Accordingly I had the window changed, so as to represent Christ outside the tomb just having passed through it, the rocky door unmoved and sealed behind Him, and the guards looking in the direction in which He is, seeing the door, but not seeing the Saviour, for Christ was visible after His Resurrection to those to whom He chose to manifest Himself, but not to others.

The Fathers in speaking of the miraculous Birth of Christ and of the fact that Mary did not lose her virginal integrity

in giving birth to her Divine Son, use the Resurrection as an illustration of the manner in which Christ was miraculously born. Christ came out from the closed womb of His mother on Christmas night, just as He came out from the sealed tomb on Easter morning, Mary's virginal integrity being as intact after His birth as was the tomb after Christ had risen. The common pictures of the Resurrection cannot be used as illustrations of Christ's miraculous Birth; if they were they would be teaching heretical doctrine; they would be illustrations of a denial of Mary's perpetual virginity. How many windows and paintings are there in the churches throughout the country which correctly represent the Resurrection? How many illustrations are there in popular Catholic magazines which correctly represent this mystery, on which we meditate every week during the year?

NICODEMUS.

THE "ALLELUJA" IN THE VERNAL OFFICE.

Qu. The rubrics state that there is no "Alleluja" in the office from Septuagesima Sunday to Vespers of Holy Saturday. Occasionally there occurs in the antiphons of the ordinary offices (also in the votive offices) throughout the year an "alleluja" which is part of the text. Is this also to be omitted; and is another "Alleluja" to be added during Paschal time when the antiphon ordinarily ends with an "Alleluja"?

Resp. The "Alleluja" is to be entirely omitted wherever it occurs in the Mass or office during the time from Septuagesima to Easter. During the Paschal season "Alleluja" is added to the Antiphons, etc., where it is not already found. The late editions of the Breviary published by the Pustets have been an improvement on other editions by omitting the "Alleluja" after the Antiphons in the *Pars Verna*. This also prevents the reader from adding a second "Alleluja" during the Paschal season where the general rubric requires but one.

NOTICE TO CATHOLIC AUTHORS.

The firm of Herder, founded at the beginning of this century (Bartholomew Herder opened a publication house and printing establishment at Meersburg in 1801, at Constance and Freiburg in 1810, at Paris in 1834), with branch houses to-day at Freiburg, Vienna, Strassburg, Munich, and St. Louis, U. S., and long known for its excellent publications in German, French, Spanish, Latin, Greek and the Semitic languages, has recently embarked in the production of high-class English literature, and promises to cover a broad field in this direction.

A notable enterprise for which material is being collected at present, and which will prove of special interest to English-speaking Catholics is the issuing of an "Almanac of Catholic Authors."

We possess already several periodical publications in other languages, which, from time to time, note the rise and progress of national literature, and help the student to form an estimate of the activity in different departments of Catholic science and culture. No such work exists up to the present in English. The editor of the proposed Almanac has requested us to call the attention of Catholic writers who have contributed to English literature in any form (book, brochure, pamphlet, periodical publications, etc.). We gladly accede to this request, and invite all such writers, cleric and lay, to send their *names* and *full address* to Wm. Bellinghausen, Esq., Freiburg (Baden), Germany.

BOOK REVIEW.

L'HYPNOTISME FRANC, par le R. P. Coconnier, O. P. Lecoffre, Paris, Rue Bonaparte 90. 1897. Pp. xii. 436.

Dr. James R. Cocke in his book on hypnotism, published four years ago, devotes some sixteen pages to the bare mention of the titles of works dealing with that subject. Much greater space would have to be assigned to tell of the kindred books and pamphlets that have poured from the press during the past few years; for no subject has of late gained so firm and far-reaching a hold on the general mind as that of hypnotism. The bulk of this kind of literature comes directly or indirectly from France, where it has created and reflects a wider and deeper interest in the subject than elsewhere. One could find a reason for this intense interest in the national character, which spontaneously reaches out to the novel and the marvellous; but a sufficiently adequate cause, which itself, however, is traceable to the reason just alleged, may be found in the extensive original researches devoted to hypnotism by men like Charcot in Paris, and Bernheim in Nancy. These two practitioners have not only founded two schools divided as to the theory of hypnotism, but by their original experimentations and the published results have stimulated the study and contributed largely to extend the therapeutic application of hypnosis throughout the civilized world. In the intense ferment of thought on the subject it is to be expected that opinions would vary widely on the nature and value of hypnotism. "According to some," as Père Coconnier observes, "hypnotism must be regarded as one of the most remarkable and beneficent discoveries of our age; as destined to transform in the happiest of ways, philosophy, literature, education, medicine, jurisprudence, all our physical and intellectual life; it is soon to become one of the principal factors, the very greatest, perhaps, of progress and civilization. Others, on the contrary, maintain that hypnotism is at bottom nothing new; that it is no benefit, but a scourge; that it is essentially immoral and hurtful, the work not of natural forces, but of the demon in person. Each of these opinions has numerous defenders, earnest and recommended by their talents, science and character—physiologists, theologians, priests, religious and bishops. And between these

opposing theorists floats in indecision the vast multitude of the uninitiated—wondering as much at the phenomena of which they hear tell, as of the extraordinary interpretations that are offered." (P. xi.)

It is this discordance of opinion in a matter in which it imports so much for private and public weal that clear and sound notions be held, especially by those who have the guidance of souls, that has led Fr. Coconnier to contribute his part to a reconciliation of theory and practice. To this end he has, by personally assisting at many experiments, made himself master of the genuine facts concerning the phenomena of hypnosis and the methods of hypnotization. To the results of this direct observation supplemented by testimonies from the highest authorities he devotes the first five chapters of the present work. After eliminating from the domain of hypnotic phenomena, the utterly foreign elements that are not infrequently associated therewith—telepathy, magnetism, spiritism and occultism—he allots three chapters to an examination of the arguments advanced, especially by Franco, against the licitude of the use of hypnotism. The rest of the book (Ch. ix.–xv.) is given to the psychology and morality of the subject. The method throughout is carefully inductive, the reasoning being kept close to controlling facts. The conculsions reached by the author may be summarized as follows:

1. Three conditions are necessary to induce the hypnotic state: (*a*) as regards the *subject*—his personal control of his psychic faculties must be greatly diminished or entirely suspended, the lower faculties being in a condition apt to receive influence and direction from without; (*b*) the *operator* must exert such influence and direction; (*c*) by means of *verbal suggestion;* (*d*) hypnosis is usually though not always accompanied by the state of ordinary sleep, and most generally with the physiological and phychological functions occurring in that state. Hence the definition of hypnosis: *a sleep or a state analogous to sleep wherein the psychic activity of the subject is influenced and directed from without by oral suggestion.*

2. (*a*) By means of genuine *hypnosis*, phenomena may be effected ranging from simple hallucinations to exudations of blood and instantaneous hemorrhages; (*b*) these phenomena are quite explicable by the well-known influence of the imagination over the organic functions.

3. (*a*) In the hands of conscientious and thoroughly skilled practitioners, hypnotic treatment has been employed in countless cases

without detriment to the patient; (*b*) many subjects have thus been cured of disease or notably relieved of pain; (*c*) on victims of drunkenness and debauchery, and on degenerate children the treatment has been used to advantage as supplementary to moral influences; (*d*) the treatment is therefore not in itself injurious.

4. Neither is it immoral if employed for a reasonable motive, by reliable agents, under circumstances physically and morally safe.

5. Hypnosis does not open out a "new psychology" which is destined to "amplify the powers of the human mind and impress a gigantic movement on civilization." Hypnosis, being essentially only "a directed dream" excluding personal psychic reflection and control, is radically incapable of such an effect.

6. Between hypnotic phenomena and miracles there is not the slightest parallel. The former are all explicable by natural causes. The latter are essentially inexplicable by such means.

7. Lastly the author makes his own the opinion of the eminent authority, Prof. Wundt. "Though unable to accord to hypnotism the extraordinary value in psychology which its admirers attribute to it, I believe none the less that in the domain of practical medicine it possesses merit that ought to be recognized. Whoever has read the detailed and objectively reasoned-out accounts by the present director of the School of Nancy, Prof. Bernheim . . . cannot but see that there is question therein of the acquisition of a therapeutic method possessing extraordinary importance . . . Therapeutics by *suggestion* is in its essential element limited to functional disorders; but this deprives it in no wise of its intrinsic value, and leaves a sufficiently wide field for its application, when we reflect how lives are rendered miserable by grave disturbances of the nervous functions; moreover the effects of *suggestion* on the secretory and vasor-motor actions are reflected over on the nutritive functions and so indirectly its influence is extended beyond the domain of immediate functional effects" (p. 430).

For the detailed unfolding of fact and principle by which this series of conclusions is reached the reader must consult the work itself. He will find the facts solidly established and carefully analyzed, the inferences legitimate, the criticisms of adverse opinions well supported, the conclusions judicious, the setting full of the interest to which the subject naturally lends itself, and the whole presented in that direct and lucid style which is the secret charm of the French. One could wish, however, that the author had given fuller development to some of the more important points. For

instance, speaking of the extraordinary phenomena of hypnosis, several instances are described of vesification and exudations of blood produced in subjects by verbal suggestion. The uninformed reader might be led to the supposition that the stigmata of saints like those of St. Francis may be accounted for by the same cause. It were desirable that the utter diversity of the two classes of phenomena had been exhibited and the impossibility of reducing them to the same origin demonstrated. The question is too large to be developed here. Some apposite reflections on the matter are to be found in *Le Miracle et ses Contrafaçons* by P. Bonniot, S.J.

F. P. S.

ORGANUM AD SELECTA ex Ordinario Missae, compositum a C. Becker, Rectore Chori in Salesiano, St. Francis, Wis.

In this fourth part of his work, the author carries out the same principles of harmonization alluded to in the notices we have given to his former installments. By treating many of the notes of the chant as passing notes, he has avoided a cumbersome style of accompaniment, and permits the melody to flow easily, without compromising correctness. He has made the harmonization *playable* without jejuneness on the one hand or heavy slowness on the other. Too much cannot be said in praise of the typographical elegance of the page.

THE SENTINEL OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. Official organ of the People's Eucharistic League. Published monthly from the Head Centre of the Work, St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York. Edited by Miss E. Lummis, 123 E. 50th St., New York. (Fifty cents a year.)

This modest little monthly now in its third issue, addresses itself officially to the members of the People's Eucharistic League, with the aim of spreading devotion to our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, and surrounding the tabernacle with a constant guard of adoration and of love. Containing each month a leaflet of adoration, notes of interests to adorers, items from all the centres of the work, a poem and a sketch or story, it cannot fail to be of great help and interest both to the associates of the League and also to the general body of the faithful. Copies are on sale at the local

churches after the meetings of the League of the Sacred Heart on first Fridays and first Sundays of the month.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF CARDINAL WISEMAN, By Wilfred Ward. In two volumes. Longmans, Green & Co. London, New York and Bombay: 1897.

(*Second Notice.*)

In 1833, whilst Mgr. Wiseman was still rector of the English College at Rome he received a visit from two young Englishmen, John Henry Newman and Hurrell Froude. Both were Protestants; and it was not until twelve years later that Newman became a Catholic. What effect their meeting with Wiseman had upon them may be gathered from a letter which Hurrell Froude wrote about Easter of that year to a friend at home. "The only thing I can put my hand on as an acquisition is having formed an acquaintance with a man of some influence at Rome, Mgr. Wiseman, the head of the English College, who enlightened Newman and me on the subject of our relations to the Church of Rome." The following passage is noteworthy as indicating that Anglicans had learnt nothing from the past, when in our day they proposed the question of reunion with the old Church on what they assumed to be a possible basis. "We got introduced to him," wrote Froude, "to find out whether they would take us in on any terms to which we could twist our consciences, and we found, to our dismay, that *not one step could be gained without swallowing the Council of Trent as a whole.* We made our approaches to the subject as delicately as we could. Our first notion was that terms of communion were within certain limits under the control of the Pope, or that in case he could not dispense solely, yet at any rate the acts of one Council might be rescinded by another—indeed, that in Charles I's time it had been intended to negotiate a reconciliation on the terms on which things stood before the Council of Trent. But we found, to our horror, that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church made the acts of each successive Council obligatory forever, that what had been once decided could never be meddled with again—in fact, that they were committed finally and irrevocably, and could not advance one step to meet us, even though the Church of England should again become what it was in Laud's time."

The influence was reciprocal. In 1847, two years after Newman had entered the Church, Wiseman wrote: "From the day of New-

man and Froude's visit to me, never for an instant did I waver in my conviction that a new era had commenced in England . . . to this grand object I devoted myself . . . the favorite studies of former years were abandoned for the pursuit of this aim alone."

In September, 1835, Wiseman arrived in London. Almost immediately he set out for a tour through England and Ireland. This would give him a proper knowledge of the religious and social temper and spirit of his countrymen whom he had had no occasion to study particularly, except as a boy.

The impressions gathered from this journey were that from a long habit of subjection the Catholics neither felt nor understood the rights which they had acquired by the Emancipation Act, and that they were unconsciously disinclined to make their influence felt in public life. They were, what their past history had made them—"a people that shunned the light of day," shrinking from freely associating with their neighbors. He would stay for some time in England, and on his return from his tour through the islands, good fortune assigned him the temporary charge of the Sardinian Embassy Chapel in Lincoln's Inn Fields; here he delivered lectures to mixed congregations which produced an immense sensation. To an old Roman fellow-student he writes (December 1835): "I have two lectures every week. The effect has been a thousand times beyond my expectations. The chapel is crowded to suffocation, every seat is occupied half an hour before the compline . . . I have never preached less than an hour and a half, generally an hour and three-quarters, yet no one has found it long, nor has attention once flagged . . . proof has been given of the interest which may be thrown round the Catholic doctrines by a little exertion." His subjects were the fundamental doctrines of Church authority, the Real Presence, Indulgences, etc., and they were simply explained so that, as he expresses it himself, "the common people say they can follow every word." In the meanwhile English Catholics became gradually alive to the fact that their faith was being treated with respect by many respectable people who were not of the faith. The Protestant papers made their comments and whether conservative or hostile they contributed to Wiseman's popularity. His success roused the spirit of enterprise among Catholics which found its first expression in the establishment of the *Dublin Review*, and a little later in the formation of the Catholic Institute for the defense of the Catholic religion. Wiseman being asked by Daniel O'Connel and Mr. Quin to join them in the foundation of a Catholic

Review, declared himself willing to assume the direction of the theological and religious part of the publication, with the understanding that "no extreme political views should be introduced into the Review." The only existing organ of a similar character was the *Catholic Magazine*. It was extremely liberal in the worst sense of the word, and hence injured the cause of Catholicity very decidedly. Thus the *Dublin Review* had more than one good reason for its creation. The first number appeared in May, 1836. Wiseman's own contributions at once gave it high tone and an augury of success. When the second number had been issued he found himself obliged to return to the post of rector at the English College in Rome; this did not, however, interrupt his interest in the work to be done in England. Indeed the following year he went back on a visit, and it was during the summer (1839) that his memorable article on St. Augustine and the Donatists appeared in the *Dublin Review* and became a turning-point in the Oxford movement, and which Newman described as "the first real hit from Romanism." Hitherto his arguments had tended mainly to show from precedents of antiquity that the Anglican claim to Apostolical succession was futile. He now showed that the idea of a schismatic church was regarded by St. Augustine and the Fathers, not as a question of historic research, but as a great practical case of conscience for the individual. This line of thought smote the earnest men engaged in the controversy regarding the claims of Anglicanism and made it a question of personal concern—and the Oxford leaders, who had conducted this inquiry as antiquarian historians, began to see the importance of the issue in a different light. Newman became alarmed at the new turn of things, and the words: "Securus judicat orbis terrarum" assumed for him a meaning that appealed to his inmost conscience. He suggested to Wilberforce that it might prove to be a duty to join the Church of Rome, and he henceforth abandoned the *via media*. In the meantime Wiseman had continued his lectures in which he emphasized the necessity of maintaining authority as the last recourse in matters of doctrine. On the other hand he urged prayer, especially devotion to our Blessed Lady. He knew how to utilize the forces of Liberalism, and in a sense was a most ardent advocate of that breadth of view which starts to convince an adversary by getting into his position and treating his prejudices with considerate forebearance.

In 1840 the number of Vicars Apostolic for England was increased from four to eight. Among the newly consecrated bishops was Dr.

Wiseman who had then returned to Rome. He was named coadjutor to Bishop Walsh and president of Oscott College. Cardinal Franzoni performed the ceremony of consecration on June 8th, in the Chapel of the English College. In the following September we find Wiseman in London. On the eve of his consecration he had written down a series of resolutions as part of a proposed plan of life in the future.

Among the *Points of Duty* we note the following with reference to the clergy.

To promote the frequenting of the Sacraments and the celebration of daily Mass by the clergy.

To encourage the preaching of the word of God in a feeling and energetic manner.

To promote study among the clergy and their serious employment of time.

To improve the studies, particularly the ecclesiastical ones, in the College.

To have Retreats for the Clergy.

With regard to his Bishop he noted the following:

To act strictly as his coadjutor, and therefore ever in act and word show him all honor.

To give him as far as possible the credit of any good done.

Never to shelter myself behind him or throw responsibility from myself on him.

To take as much labor on myself as possible.

Under the head of *Points of Zeal* he notes the following:

To have missions as soon as possible, and a body of clergy available for that purpose.

By this means to get the truth preached where there are no Catholic congregations.

To have a house of Retreats for Laity.

To get the Forty Hours' Devotion established as soon as possible, that the Adorable Sacrament may be day and night worshipped.

Points of Prudence.

(Fundamental Maxims.)

1. To attempt no changes that can affect the clergy, till their confidence has been completely won.

2. This is to be done by sincere kindness in word and deed, such as results from humility,—that is, from feeling, as I have every reason to do, that I am the last and most unworthy of them all.

3. To prepare by Retreats and Conferences their minds for reform and improvements.

(Measures.)

1. To gain exact information, and from every parish.
2. To have, if possible, visitation in due form.
3. To have Diocesan Synods in full form, so as to make the clergy parties to improvements. In these to get a fixed system of practice respecting converts; a uniformity of prayers and observances, regulations about church functions, etc.
4. To have regular Rural Deanships, by means of which information can be collected, etc.
5. To form a council that can meet for ordinary business, if possible, once a week.

He concludes by: "God's grace enable me to carry these things into execution for His greater honor and glory, the good of souls, and my own poor soul's eternal salvation. Amen."

In his capacity as coadjutor Dr. Wiseman was also president of Oscott College, where he lived. Here he was greatly esteemed and liked by the students, but did not succeed, if indeed he ever attempted the task, of amalgamating the heterogeneous elements of the teaching or governing faculty. Lord Acton, who was a student at this time at the college, records his impressions to the effect that Wiseman made no effort to direct the teaching body. "He was thinking of other things and looking far afield, and these other things were what characterized him. We used to see him with Lord Shrewsbury, with O'Connell, with Father Mathew, with a Mesopotamian patriarch, with Newman, with Pugin, and we had a feeling that Oscott, next to Pekin, was a centre of the world." Of Pugin's peculiarities several amusing stories are here incidentally told by Dr. Ward. He had an utter aversion to the mixed style of church architecture and would roundly condemn anything that compromised the Gothic simplicity to which he devoted his tastes. The Roman predilection for promiscuous ornamentation actually shocked him. He visited Sant'Andrea delle Fratte, the scene where the Abbé Ratisbonne had been converted from Judaism by a vision of our Lady. "The story," Pugin said, after seeing the church, "is demonstrably false. The man could not have said a prayer in such a hideous church. Our Lady *could* not have chosen such a church for a vision. The man could have had no piety in him to have stayed in such a church at all." The friend to whom his remarks were addressed replied: "As I heard the story, Ratisbonne was not at the moment praying, but thinking of the uncouthness of the architecture of the place." Pugin's whole face changed.

"Is that so? Then he was a man of God. He knew what true Christianity was, though he was a Jew. I honor him. Our Lady would have come to him *anywhere*. The story is demonstrably true." Pugin and Wiseman worked for a long time hand in hand in restoring reverence for the ancient liturgical forms, though they were of a totally different temper of mind. Pugin was the first link between English Catholics and the Oxford School, and his intimacy with Oakeley, Faber, W. G. Ward, Dalgairns and Bloxam had no little influence in turning them decidedly Romeward after Newman had openly challenged public opinion by his famous Tract 90. When eventually Newman and Ward, as spokesmen of their party, admitted the duty of reunion with the Church of Rome as soon as the latter should reform her abuses, Wiseman replied that the supposition of abuses authoritatively sanctioned by Rome rested upon inaccurate information or misapprehension.

"This repeated wish that Rome may be different from what she is, may be satisfied in various ways. . . . For instance, blots may be removed from an object by being wiped away from the medium through which it was viewed, and which transferred its own defects to the object; and in like manner Rome may soon appear and be very different to sincere eyes that look at her now through distorted representations. . . . Again, a part of a picture may seem dark and unpleasant, not because its colors are so, but because sufficient light is not cast upon it; and so many things appear cheerless and painful to others, not because truly so, but because they want proper light to be cast upon them by reasonable explanation. Or the defect may arise from the very position of the spectator. A pious and intelligent person observed to me the other day that our devotions to the saints might be compared to their representations on our beautiful old church windows; when seen from without they present but dark surfaces and ill-shaped outlines; when seen from within the church they seemed to glow with the rich and varied light of heaven in pure and majestic forms."

On the other hand, he felt that Catholics had a duty to reform, not the Church, but their lives, in order to remove these prejudices. "Let us English Catholics mourn over our own backwardness in much that is of duty, our own coldness in much that is of zeal. Let the English clergy lament our deficiencies in much of that ecclesiastical tone and spirit which abroad gives regularity to the sacerdotal ministry and influences the commonest actions and habits of the priest."

In the summer of 1844 Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church* appeared and brought to a crisis the Romeward tendency of the Oxford movement by showing that Rome is the great exemplar to which all religious organization must conform, and that the notion of corruption, as applied to the Church, is a misapprehension. The

subsequent story of Newman's entrance into the Church and its accompanying circumstances are well known. The effect of it on Bishop Wiseman is well expressed in a letter to Dr. Russell :

"On All Saints, Newman, Oakeley and the other two were confirmed, and we had ten quondam Anglican clergymen in the chapel. Has this ever happened before since the Reformation? Newman took the name of Mary. . . . I have often said I should be ready to sing my *Nunc dimittis* when Mr. Newman should have joined us ; and I must not draw back from my word."

Withal Wiseman had his troubles. Despite his apparent popularity there was really none among the Catholic clergy who seriously sympathized or coöperated with him in the work that seemed so necessary and inviting. Newman said of him that he was "the chief or rather the only promoter" among English Catholics of the great Catholic objects on which they had set their hearts. And we get a glimpse of Bishop Wiseman's consciousness of this fact in a *memorandum* of that time.

"Perhaps seldom before have I felt more completely the peculiarity of my position in my *total isolation* as regards support and counsel, as well as sympathy and concurrence in views and plans.

"I came to England and into this district and college without a claim upon anyone's kindness or indulgence, with overrated abilities, exaggerated reputation for learning, overestimated character in every respect. I was placed in a position of heavy responsibility and arduous labor. No one on earth knows what I went through in head and heart during my years of silent and solitary sorrow. In the house I have reason now to know that *not one* was working with me, thought with me or felt with me. Many an hour of the lonely night have I passed in prayers and tears by the lamp of the sanctuary. . . . What a different place it (the college) would be if all had labored with this view (England's regeneration) and for this purpose? But thank God it has done its work in spite of us ; in spite of our miserable strifes and petty jealousies, and narrow views."

In midsummer of 1847 Wiseman went to Rome, having been deputed by the English Bishops to ascertain the views of the Holy See regarding the reëstablishment of the Hierarchy in England. But he stayed only a short time, being recalled to England on a diplomatic mission. Newman, who had been in Rome since the autumn of the preceding year, returned some months after this to settle the *locale* of the Oratory, which Wiseman, who had in the

meantime been appointed Pro-Vicar Apostolic of the London District, desired to have in London.

The next chapter deals with the establishment of a new Hierarchy in England under Pius IX. It includes one of the most stirring and eventful episodes in the life of Wiseman, and, hence, we shall reserve its discussion to a separate notice in our next review of this important biography.

(*To be continued.*)

RECORDS OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PHILADELPHIA. Published quarterly by the Society. Vol. IX., No. 1, March, 1898. $2.00 per year.

The American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia has of late years established for itself an unquestionable character of national importance, and if the energies which have brought it to its present point of efficiency meet with continued appreciation on the part of the scholarly portion of our Catholic population, this Society is sure to wield a strong influence for the maintenance and honor of Catholicity in America.

The present number of the "Records" may be taken as a typical expression of the work done by the society. In former times the publication confined itself mainly to the reprinting of facts, without much attempt at making the matter entertaining to the average reader; and so far the "Records" were true to their nominal and originally intended purpose. But in time it became evident that a more popular form which, without neglecting the skeleton of carefully selected facts, should put them in appropriate and living form, would appeal to a larger circle of readers and students, whom the society wished to reach and make coöperators in building up a good history of the Catholic Church in America. This has been done. The "Papers Relating to the Church in America" printed from the portfolios of the Irish College at Rome and now in their sixth series, are extremely interesting, containing as they do the correspondence of men whom we have all known to be great and important factors in the ecclesiastical history during the early half of the present century, but whose inner lives showing forth the mainsprings of their personal influence become known to us only from their letters. The sketch of the life of the Rev. Dr. Joseph Balfe collected by the indefatigable Francis X. Reuss is a delightful contrast to the biographical notices of living celebrities

which are for the most part nauseating by their fulsome flatteries, and rarely free from the suspicion of being half-inspired—mere advertisements in which the profit is shared by hero and writer. Dr. Balfe belonged to the class of scholarly priests whose worth is realized in life only by the thoughtful, in death by all—"et in die defunctionis suae benedicetur" (Eccli. i., 13). But the reading of such lives ennobles. The extracts from the Missionary Diary of the Rev. Patrick Kenny contain much quiet humor and make altogether pleasant reading.

The Historical Picture Gallery is a notable and entertaining feature of the "Records," and will in time present a valuable collection. It seems to us that if the professors of History in our seminaries and colleges were to put themselves in active and permanent communication with the Managing Board of the Society, they might derive considerable profit from the union by promoting interest in historical study among their students. There is abundant talent in our educational centres, which, if directed into channels of active inquiry would eventually produce eminent results and reflect credit on the colleges themselves. The occasion for such activity is given in the work done by the Society, whose directors are certainly anxious to utilize facts and documents referring to the growth of our educational establishments if made known to them through a responsible medium.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

APOLOGIE DES CHRISTENTHUM'S. Von Dr. Fr. Hettinger. Vol. IV. Seventh Edition, by Dr. Eugene Mueller. Freiburg Brisg. 1897. (St. Louis, Mo.) B. Herder: Pp. 618. Pr. bd. $1.70.

LA SAINTE BIBLE POLYGLOTTE. Contenant le Texte Hébreu Original, le Texte Grec des Septante, le Texte Latin de la Vulgate et la traduction française de M. L' abbé Glaire. Introductions, Notes, Cartes, et Illustrations par F. Vigouroux, S.S. Ancien Testament. Tome I. Le Pentateuque. 1er fascicule. La Genèse. Paris: A. Roger et F. Chernoviz; Montréal: Cadieux et Derome. 1898. Pp. 272. Pr. 75 cents.

THE FRANCISCANS IN CALIFORNIA. By Fr. Zephyrin Englehardt, O.S.F. With a map and numerous illustrations. Cum permissu Superiorum. Printed and published at the Holy Childhood Indian School, Harbor Springs, Mich. 1897. Pp. 516. Pr. $1.70.

THE CANADIAN MESSENGER HYMNAL. Over one hundred Sacred Hymns with organ accompaniment, also prayers for Mass and Communion for the use of League Centres, Schools, Parishes.—Sacred Heart Offices: Montreal. 1 vol. in 8° of 220 pages. 25 cents.